Vol. LXXVII, No. 3 September, 1927

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE GENEALOGY OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC BIBLE 225
The Rev. WILLIAM SHARP, S.J., Oxford, England.
THE CONNEXION BETWEEN CLASSICAL, PATRISTIC AND MEDIEVAL LATIN .. 238
The Rev. JOSEPH P. CHRISTOPHER, Ph.D., Washington, D. C.
IS THE CHURCH OCCIDENTALIZED? 243
The Rev. JOHN-MARY SIMON O.S.M., Caliente, Nevada.
MENTAL AND SPIRITUAL CURES. II. Healing Religions and Their Cures. 250
JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., New York City.
PERSONAL FALLACIES IN SPIRITUAL LIFE 262
W. J. K.
A MEDICO-MORAL PROBLEM—ECTOPIC GESTATION 275
The Rev. HENRY DAVIS, S.J., London, England.
MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. Chinese Catholic Life. 292
The Rev. FRANCIS X. FORD, A.F.M., Kaying, China.
WHERE THE CHOICE OF A CATECHISM IS ALL IMPORTANT 295
CHURCH AND STATE IN EDUCATION 298
SOLEMN BAPTISM BY A CHAPLAIN 301
BENEFICE OF ASSISTANT PASTORATE. 306
SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT EXTRAVAGANCES. 314
RECENT THEOLOGY 317
The Rev. FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R., S.T.D., Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, New York.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
1305 Arch St., Philadelphia

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1927: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1924, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and are the only wines having the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✣ ✣ ✣

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✣ ✣ ✣

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich mellow wholesome character are the ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✣ ✣ ✣

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

The I. Donnelly Company
408-410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

Fee Brothers
21-27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

William Moran Agency
873 Payne Avenue
St. Paul, Minn.

J. Redmond Covick
33 South Wells Street
Chicago, Ill.

Sievers Church Goods Co.
228 East Commerce Street
San Antonio, Texas

or direct from

The Covick Company, 330 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Cal.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

L. L. FARRELL (President)

Vineyards:

Washingtonville, Est. 1839
Livermore, California

Address all communications to:

New York Office
71 Barclay Street

The Brotherhood is one of the oldest and largest Altar wine houses in this country. We allow no dealers to handle our Altar wines, all shipments being made direct to the Reverend Clergy from our vineyards at Washingtonville, New York.

Mr. L. L. Farrell, the President, has devoted his entire life to the Altar wine industry, and all shipments are made under his personal supervision.

Requests for price lists and application blanks will have prompt attention

CONTENTS CONTINUED

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

A Medico-Moral Problem—Ectopic Gestation. (*The Rev. Henry Davis, S.J., London, England*) 275

Maryknoll Mission Letters. Chinese Catholic Life. (*The Rev. Francis X. Ford, A.F.M., Kaying, China*) 292

Where the Choice of a Catechism is All Important. (*Missionarius*) 295

Church and State in Education 298

Solemn Baptism by Chaplain. (*N. S.*) 301

Administering Holy Communion in Different Rooms of an Institution 304

Benefice of Assistant Pastorate. (*Vindex*) 306

Restitution to Bonding Company. (*J. L. E.*) 313

School Commencement Extravagances 314

Recent Pontifical Appointments 315

The Rosary Devotion during the Month of October 315

Indulgence for the Prayer to St. Joseph 316

Office of the Titular Feast of St. Jude 316

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Theology. (*The Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D., Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, New York*. 317

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Ryan: The Encyclicals of Pius XI. 324

Heuser: The House of Martha at Bethany 325

Siegfried-Hemming: America Comes of Age 327

Philips: La Raison d'Être du Mal d'après Saint Augustin 330

Lejeune: La Vie Contemplative 331

Tarker: Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul 332

LITERARY CHAT 333

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

American Ecclesiastical Review *Dolphin Press* 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia

Book Suggestions

The House of Martha at Bethany

This is a sequel to *In the Workshop of St. Joseph*, and continues the story of the first beginnings of Christianity. **$1.50**

+ + +

In the Workshop of Saint Joseph

Both in contents and in format, this newly-published volume is redolent of Bethlehem and of Nazareth and of the spirit of the season. A gift that will be most welcome. **$1.75**

+ + +

The Chaplain of Saint Catherine's

Pronounced on all sides to be most entertaining and instructive. **$2.00**

+ + +

An Ex-Prelate's Meditations

In the same vein as the volume next above, this book likewise, according to the reviewers, is sure both to please and to edify. **$1.75**

+ + +

Pastor Halloft

Recounts the career of a zealous American pastor whose long and fruitful ministry was amid somewhat novel and unusual conditions. **$1.50**

+ + +

The Autobiography of an Old Breviary

Conveys much useful information about the Priests' Prayer Book in a quite attractive way. **$1.75**

+ + +

Canon Sheehan of Doneraile

The story of an Irish Parish Priest as told chiefly by himself in books, personal memoirs, and letters.

It gives a glimpse of the Irish churchman's inner mind and motives, as they unfold themselves in his successive volumes. The recital of his quiet and influential activities makes the biography a rich contribution to contemporary Irish history, besides throwing light on a priestly life that deserves to be known for the lessons and interest it holds. **$3.50**

May be procured at any Catholic bookstore or from

American Ecclesiastical Review, 1305 Arch St., Philadelphia

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LXXVII).—SEPTEMBER, 1927.—No. 3.

THE GENEALOGY OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC BIBLE.

AS this title is open to considerable misunderstanding, it may be well at the outset to state our purpose more definitely. Everybody knows that the Bible we use was not originally written in English. Many when questioned would say that it is translated from Latin, or Greek, or Hebrew. Few would be prepared offhand to trace the history of the Bible's English text throughout the ages, or to speak with much certainty of the stages which must have intervened between the present-day form and its primitive beginnings. That is what we here propose to do in outline, omitting irrelevant complications and disputed points as far as may be.

The various books which go to make up our Old Testament were written at different times, and nearly all were in Hebrew, the writings of Moses, David and Isaias moreover being most probably in the ancient Hebrew-Phenician alphabet. Later books were written for the most part in the "square" letters still found in Jewish manuscripts and books. Wisdom, however, and II Maccabees were written in Greek; and some of Daniel, and seven or eight chapters of Esdras in Aramaic.[1]

Biblical chronology is a thorny subject, and it would be difficult to say at what date the "autographs",[2] or sacred writers' own manuscripts first appeared. Nor do we know when these

[1] Aramaic was a dialect closely connected with Hebrew, being a kindred branch of the same Semitic family of speech. It was first adopted by the Jews after their return from the Captivity, and became the current language of everyday life.

[2] Original MSS. are known as "autographa", and copyists' and scribes' reproductions as "apographa".

primitive manuscripts perished, though many had certainly disappeared two thousand years ago.

For the earliest history of the Sacred Writings we turn to the Bible itself, premising that there can be no question for us, after the reply of the Biblical Commission, 27 June, 1906, about the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in the sense there explained.

Moses entrusted his work to the care of the Levites. "After Moses had wrote the words of this law in a volume, and finished it: he commanded the Levites, who carried the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying: Take this book, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God."[3] Next came the writings of Josue, who "wrote all these things in the volume of the law of the Lord".[4] Then Samuel "told the people the law of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord."[5] Thus by successive additions was formed a collection of Sacred Books, jealously guarded, and the task of copying and studying these, and explaining them to the people, was confided to the schools of learned men, most probably the Priests.

The next additions are recorded in 1 Paralipomenon 29:29, where we read that "the acts of King David first and last are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet and in the book of Gad the seer." The Psalms of David and Asaph seem to have been held as sacred from the first, and the same is true of the parables of Solomon, "which the men of Ezechias king of Juda copied out".[6]

At a later date these carefully preserved writings appear to have been neglected and almost forgotten, for in 4 Kings 22-23 and 2 Par. 34 we are told that, when Josias had the temple repaired, Helcias the high priest discovered the book of the law by the hand of Moses in the house of the Lord. The king promptly read it in the hearing of all the people, and they promised "to perform the words of this covenant, which were written in that book."

All the Sacred Writings were supposed to have been lost during the Babylonian Exile, and the story of their miraculous restoration is narrated in the extra-canonical 4 Esdras 14:18-

[3] Deut. 31:9-13, 24-26.
[4] Josue 24:25-26.
[5] 1 Kings 10:25.
[6] Proverbs 25:1.

47. According to this account, ninety-four[7] books were dictated by God within the space of forty days. Seventy of them were to be hidden, the remainder published at once. In Nehemias 9 and 10 we are told how Esdras, on the return from exile, read the law of Moses to all the people, whereupon four score and four men, priests and levites, heads of families and chiefs of tribes covenanted to observe the law of God and of Moses. We learn elsewhere too how, for the second Temple, "these same things were set down in the memoirs, and commentaries of Nehemias: and how he made a library, and gathered together out of the countries, the books both of the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings, and concerning the holy gifts."[8]

Thus it is that Esdras is usually credited with promulgating the Pentateuch as a whole, somewhere about B. C. 440, and "canonising"[9] that portion of the Old Testament known as "The Law." Concerning the other two portions, "The Prophets" and "The Writings", opinions are not unanimous; but they were probably declared "canonical" between B. C. 300 and 150, and B. C. 170 and 135 respectively.

When Alexander the Great died, his conquests passed into the hands of his generals, and Greek rule succeeded to Persian. The most momentous consequence of this change, as far as we are here concerned, was the translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek, and the first notice of the Bible as a definite collection of writings is found in the Prologue to the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus. This Greek version, known as the Septuagint (LXX), we owe ultimately to the bibliographical zeal of Ptolemy Philadelphus,[10] who wanted to add the Sacred Books of the Hebrews to the magnificent library at Alexandria. There was a flourishing colony of Jews in the city and the translators were selected from their

[7] The reading "ducenti quattuor" of the Latin MSS. is corrupt. However, the story is of little historical or critical value.

[8] 2 Maccabees 2:13.

[9] Those books or writings which contained sound and inspired doctrine were said to constitute the recognized list or "canon". The Church's official limitation of the "canon" came later.

[10] The Ptolemies reigned in Egypt from B. C. 304 to B. C. 30. The first, Ptolemy Soter, founded the Library at Alexandria. Ptolemy Philadelphus, B. C. 286-246, helped to increase the number of MSS., which is said to have ultimately reached 400,000.

community. How many shared the work we do not know, as it was spread over some forty years, B. C. 285-247. It is clear from the Septuagint itself that not all the collaborators were equally fitted for their task, either because they were not familiar enough with Greek or because they did not know sufficient Hebrew. This latter reason may seem strange, but we must bear in mind the fact that Hebrew had been a dead language since about B. C. 400, and that a generation had grown up at Alexandria acquainted neither with the original tongue of their Sacred Books nor with the Aramaic dialect in daily use among the Jews of Palestine. Despite its shortcomings, however, and the unevenness of its translation, the Greek Septuagint is of supreme importance, since it is the earliest version ever made into any language. The Old Testament in the original Hebrew would have been confined to a comparatively small portion of the known world; translated into Greek, it spread throughout the then inhabited globe, and was everywhere current among the Jews at the time of our Lord's Birth. This was the Bible known to Mary and Simeon before His coming, and this was the Bible used by our Lord Himself, and His Apostles and their successors throughout the first hundred and fifty years of the Church's history.[11]

Arrived now at the Christian era, with a Greek Old Testament in general use, we turn to the beginnings and origin of the New Testament. Many years elapsed before the oral accounts of the life and teachings of our Lord were given permanent form in writing. Great importance was attached to the spoken word of those who had lived with and repeatedly listened to the Apostles themselves; memories so sacred were most carefully treasured; and no one ever thought of sitting down and writing a detailed history of our Lord or a verbatim report of His parables for the benefit of future generations. However, the catechetical outlines taught to neophytes came in time to be written down, and during the second half of the first century, at what precise date cannot be determined, the

[11] So S. F. Pells in *The Church's Ancient Bible*, pp. 15-16, and others. But the Jews of Palestine, unlike those of Alexandria, would certainly be familiar with the Hebrew Bible also. However, while our Lord would usually speak the current Aramaic, it is interesting to note that of the 37 O. T. quotations recorded in the Gospels as coming from Him, as many as 33 correspond almost word for word with the Septuagint version and not with the Hebrew original.

Gospels, Epistles and Acts which constitute our New Testament were committed to writing, all being, like the current Old Testament, in Greek, except for St. Matthew's Gospel which was in Aramaic, the usual speech of the Palestinian Jews for whom primarily it was intended. Many other letters and fragmentary accounts were produced and circulated, with the result that the question of "canonicity" had to be settled. The Canon of Muratori, about 165 A. D., was an attempt to determine what should and what should not be considered "canonical". It was the persecution under Diocletian in 303 which definitely concentrated attention upon this point, since the persecutors demanded that the Sacred Scriptures be given up. The Christians had therefore to know what would rightfully come under this category. As Eusebius, writing at this date, points out, some books were universally acknowledged as sacred and inspired, others were doubtful, and some were certainly spurious—such works as the Apocryphal Gospels and the Apocalypse of Peter being included in this last division. There are solid reasons for thinking that the Council of Nicaea in 325 published a list of the Canonical Books, but no trace of it can now be found. Nothing therefore can be said to have been defined till 397, when the Council of Carthage authoritatively determined the canon of the New Testament as we have it to-day.

By the year A. D. 400, therefore, our complete Bible existed and was known as a unified collection of Sacred Writings. Books, however, as we know them are a product of a much later age. "Volumes" or rolls of manuscript, and "codices" or bound collections of papyrus or vellum pages, were the predecessors of our modern books. The volumes and codices from which we derive the printed text of our Bible to-day were all, of course, done by hand; they are therefore comparatively rare, especially as many have perished in the long centuries that have intervened. The story of the transmission of these texts throughout the ages is full of interest, but too long and complicated for us to attempt here; a very sketchy account, with but a brief mention of the outstanding achievements, must suffice. Our main concern at first, for obvious reasons, will be with the Old Testament text. The translators of the Septuagint, as we have already seen, had not produced a first-

class piece of work, and the subsequent errors of scribes and copyists resulted in countless textual corruptions. A remedy was sought, and many laudable efforts were made to recover at least a correct version of the primitive text. Thus Aquila about 130 A. D., with a view to correcting the mistakes in the Septuagint, made a Greek translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch so slavishly literal as to be often quite unintelligible. Theodotion almost contemporaneously produced in Greek what is rather a revision of the Septuagint than an independent version. Symmachus some fifty years later rendered the Hebrew, sense for sense rather than word for word, into a Greek remarkable for its clearness and elegance.

The existence of these and other versions, however, seems to have made confusion worse confounded, and the mixing up of different readings by copyists helped matters not at all. Origen, therefore, the greatest scholar and probably the most indefatigable worker of his age, set himself the stupendous task of assembling all the Greek translations of the Septuagint then extant and correcting the Greek text by what he considered the best and most probable readings. The result was his famous "Hexapla". Each page of this prodigious work, which must have run to at least 12,000 sheets, was divided into columns. Side by side were reproduced the current Hebrew text, a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew, the versions of Aquila and Symmachus, Origen's own corrected reading of the Septuagint, and, in the sixth column, Theodotion's revision. In some places, extra columns were added for one or more of the anonymous Greek translations usually known as Quinta, Sexta, and Septima. Origen was born in A. D. 185, and his Hexapla was finished by 231, according to some authors, though others are compelled to say between 240 and 245, remembering that he spent much time studying Plato and the Stoics, made himself a master of Hebrew, journeyed to Arabia, Palestine, Antioch and Greece, and wrote voluminous commentaries on the Gospels, large numbers of homilies, tractates, letters, and other works, totaling six thousand, according to St. Epiphanius, though St. Jerome reduces the figure to two thousand. A manuscript like the Hexapla, running to fifty volumes, was not likely to be copied out in its entirety; and as the original seems unfortunately to have perished when

Caesarea was captured and sacked by the Saracens in A. D. 638, we have only such portions as had been reproduced. Among these happily is Origen's own "corrected" Septuagint as found in his fifth column. This had been published by Eusebius and Pamphilus half a century after Origen's death, and would have proved invaluable to later ages had not subsequent copyists carelessly omitted the obelus, metobelus and asterisk scrupulously inserted by Origen to indicate his alterations in and additions to the accepted text. Omissions of such vital importance resulted in even greater confusion than had existed before, and for our knowledge of Origen's Septuagint we are most indebted to a Syriac version of A. D. 617 which faithfully reproduces the critical symbols. So much for the Greek Old Testament text.

Long before Origen was even born, Christianity had spread far beyond the confines of the Greek-speaking world, and it is not surprising to find a Latin translation of the Greek Bible current in Africa some forty or fifty years previous to the Hexapla. Many Latin versions of at least parts of the Bible must have appeared halfway through the second century, or even earlier, and as they antedate our oldest manuscripts of the Greek Bible by some two centuries, and were very literal renderings of the original, they would have been extremely valuable, had they not almost entirely perished. So numerous were the copies made as time went on, and so numerous in consequence the textual corruptions, that by the end of the fourth century various Old Latin Bibles were in use, some of which had been corrected and altered to agree with different Greek manuscripts. Accordingly Pope Damasus in A. D. 382 entrusted to St. Jerome, another indefatigable Biblical scholar, the task not of translating anew but of revising and correcting the accepted Latin New Testament, with a view to securing an "authorized version". St. Jerome completed and published the Gospels the next year, 383, venturing to make one change of considerable importance. The Old Latin had always put the two Apostles, Matthew and John before Luke and Mark. St. Jerome introduced the Greek order now so familiar to us, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

After the death of St. Damasus, St. Jerome retired to Bethlehem, and there, entirely as a private venture, he within

the next fifteen years made a new translation of the proto-canonical[12] books of the Old Testament, direct from the Hebrew into Latin. He courageously passed over the Septuagint, considered even by such authorities as Tertullian and St. Augustine to be inspired, because he judged it to be, as a text, inferior to the Hebrew. Many interruptions, ill health and failing eyesight which necessitated dictation, an invasion of the Huns, undue haste, and the fact (which he bitterly laments) that the lack of vowel-points multiplied ambiguities in the Hebrew, combined to make Jerome's work fall short of a perfect achievement. Yet his Vulgate is a fine readable version, giving the sense accurately in a free and idiomatic translation, and it has received the unqualified praise of all discerning critics as an *opus classicum* unequaled throughout fifteen hundred years. Not that it was given a particularly cordial welcome on its first appearance. The difficulties attending the introduction of the Anglican Revised Version in England, and the mixed reception accorded to the alternative Book of Common Prayer, will enable us to realize that, in an age usually looked upon as less enlightened than our own, a new text of the Bible would lay its editor open to no little criticism. Many who had been brought up to know and love the old readings failed to understand the critical reasons behind St. Jerome's alterations. To others it seemed a piece of unparalleled impertinence that Jerome should pretend to understand the Hebrew Bible better than "the Seventy", or that he should set himself to improve upon the Bible used by our Lord Himself and the Apostles. A long time elapsed, therefore, before its superior accuracy and scholarship gave St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate the undisputed victory over the Old Latin versions, but by the twelfth century all copying of other manuscripts had ceased and it reigned supreme.

Throughout the Middle Ages, Latin was the language in which almost all books were written, the language of all educated men and women, the language of intercommunication between nations. And it was the Latin Bible of St. Jerome that was propagated throughout the West, multiplied by copy-

[12] Books found in the Hebrew Bibles as well as the Greek are said to belong to the first canon,—proto-canonical. Those found only in the Greek Bibles are deutero-canonical.

ists in the monasteries of Christendom, and ultimately translated into the different languages of Europe. The text was, of course, as always, corrupted in the transmission. It is important to remember also that, as a monastery's complete Bible might easily consist of portions copied from manuscripts differing vastly in origin, value and date, a difficult task awaited the learned men who at various times sought to regain the text of St. Jerome pure and unalloyed.

A mere enumeration of the attempts made in this direction would prove long and uninteresting, but we may single out the efforts of Alcuin at Tours about the year 800, of Lanfranc in 1089, and of St. Stephen Harding about 1150. Alcuin's text, based largely on the MSS. he consulted at the famous Northumbrian scriptoria,[13] was of outstanding merit, and this was the one chosen for standard use by the newly-founded University of Paris at the beginning of the 13th century. Among the Doctors here was Stephen Langton, afterward Archbishop of Canterbury, and to him is usually attributed the division of the Bible into chapters. Later came sub-divisions into seven sections, indicated by the letters A-G in the margin. Last of all, the short verses were introduced by the distinguished Paris printer, Etienne, in 1551.

The invention of printing marks the beginning of a new era in the textual history of the Bible. Copyists had simply multiplied wrong readings; printers did at least turn out several copies of the same text,—and if misprints abounded, they were the same in all. The first book to issue from the printing-press in Europe was the two-volume Latin Vulgate of 1456. Twenty-five copies still exist, one being in the British Museum. This early but exceedingly fine work is usually known as the Mazarin Bible, from the fact that the copy which first attracted general attention in later times was that in the Library of Cardinal Mazarin. Within the next fifty years, no fewer than 124 editions of the Latin Bible were printed,—rather an awkward fact for those to face who accuse the Catholic Church of discouraging Bible reading in the Middle Ages. Attention was thus drawn to the immense numbers of discrepancies

[13] The monastic houses at Jarrow and Wearmouth were especially distinguished for the MSS. copied out in their "scriptoria", large rooms set apart and well equipped for this very important work of manuscript preserving and reproducing.

and variants, and critical editions began to appear, the most scholarly perhaps being that brought out by Etienne. This excellent achievement, the foundation of our present New Testament, dates first from 1528, but a revised edition, corrected by reference to seventeen old MSS., was published between 1538 and 1540. Six years after this latter date, the Council of Trent proposed that a corrected text of the Vulgate should be prepared, and that, of all the versions extant, the Vulgate alone should be acknowledged as "authentic".[14] The revisers appointed soon realized that they were confronted with a Herculean task, the times were troublous, and a series of vexatious delays retarded the undertaking. It was not till 1590 that there issued from the press what is known as the Sixtine Vulgate, a text which in many places embodied the private views of Pope Sixtus V rather than of the revisers. Two years later, 1592, Pope Clement VIII's commission produced a revised Clementine Vulgate, differing from the Sixtine, which it superseded, in over 2,000 places. Here at last we have the Latin original from which all the texts in use to-day are derived. But before proceeding further and tracing the genealogy of our own English Bible, it must again be emphasized that what had been aimed at was not a correction of St. Jerome's work but a restoration of the current text to the state in which it was left by St. Jerome. Moreover, the Latin Vulgate of Clement should be spoken of as *an* authentic text, not *the* authentic. It is one of many authentic texts, but it holds a special position as the official text of the Latin portion of the Catholic Church. Nor should we forget that this Vulgate is a strangely composite work. The New Testament, as we have seen, is St. Jerome's correction of the old Latin version from the original Greek; the Psalter is his second revision, based on the Septuagint of Origen's Hexapla and corresponding exactly with the old Latin; Judith and Tobias are Jerome's translation of the Aramaic. It seems not improbable that the saint's third and best version of the Psalter, made directly from the Hebrew and often reproduced in old MSS. but never widely accepted, may replace our unsatisfactory Gallican[15]

[14] "Authentic" was first used of autographa, later of faithful apographa, and then of translations, conformable with the original. In Trent, "authentic" means "official".

[15] So called because it was first adopted in Gaul.

translation when the new typical edition of the Roman Breviary is issued. Indeed, the present Vulgate text may itself be superseded when the Benedictines have completed their adequate and scholarly collection and coördination of variant readings, a task entrusted to them by Pope Pius X in 1907. Then perhaps will be imperative a new English translation of the Bible, differing not a little from the Douay Version now in general use among English-speaking Catholics.

We have said that Latin was the language of educated men, the language in which most books were written, in the Middle Ages. It would be an egregious mistake to conclude from that statement that vernacular Bibles, or portions of Bibles, were unknown, and that prior to the 16th century those of our forefathers who knew no Latin were complete strangers to the Bible. Between the invention of the printing-press in 1438 and the appearance of Luther's faulty Bible a century later, no fewer than 626 editions of the Bible or portions of it had been published in the different languages of Europe. Taking England alone, and going back further still, we find that Caedmon about the year 680 had paraphrased portions of the Old Testament; St. Bede translated at least the Gospels; King Alfred, Aelfric of Peterborough, William of Shoreham and Richard Rolle of Hampole had all put into the vernacular at least portions of the Old and New Testaments before the middle of the 14th century. True, the Synod of Oxford in 1408 had forbidden the publication and reading of unauthorized translations, but this was with a view to preserving the correct text, as the Lollards did not scruple to garble and mistranslate passages which were not to their liking.

All this, however, does not alter the fact that there was really very little reading done in those days. Manuscripts and early printed books were comparatively rare and expensive, and most of the people who could not read Latin were no more able to read English or Anglo-Norman. Besides, the peasant folk then, as now in so many instances, depended for their knowledge of the Bible on the sermons and instructions of their priests. The importance of such early vernacular versions as Wyclif's (so-called, though it may be a pre-Reformation Catholic work), Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and the Bishops', must lie principally, it would seem, in the influence

on the translations later accepted as the best English equivalents for the original texts. Whatever may be thought of their literary value, there can be no doubt that successive Protestant versions unfortunately proved unscholarly, and, from a Catholic point of view, unsatisfactory. Private judgment and lack of respect for either authority or tradition led to manifest and intentional mistranslations, with the result that very different renderings were to be found for one and the same original passage.[16] No Catholic could describe these perversions of the Sacred Books otherwise than as false, corrupt and heretical. Hence the need for Catholics of a true and exact English translation, which need was admirably met by the Douay Bible. The only misleading thing about this is its name, since it was all translated at Rheims between the years 1578 and 1593, and none of it at Douay, though the Old Testament was first published there in 1609. The principal collaborators were William Allen, Gregory Martin, Richard Bristow, John Reynolds and Thomas Worthington, graduates all of Oxford University, and men of unquestioned learning and fitness for the enterprise on which they had embarked. "On October 16th or thereabouts," says the Douay Diary of 1578, "Mr. Martin Licentiate, began the translation of the Bible into English; thus at length we shall be enabled to meet the corruptions which the heretics have now for so long a time unfortunately forced upon nearly all our countrymen. In order that this work, an exceedingly useful one, may appear as quickly as possible, he undertakes to translate two chapters a day; and in order to secure its accuracy, our President, Mr. Allen, and also Mr. Bristow, undertake to diligently read the said chapters and faithfully to correct anything which may seem to call for it." Dr. Martin appears to have done all the actual translation, Bristow annotating the New Testament, and Worthington the Old. The Diary for March 1582 makes a casual note of the conclusion of the first part of the great work: "This month the last touches were put to the English translation of the New Testament". The Old Testament, though finished, could not be published till after a delay of nearly thirty years, "by lack of good means", as the translators lament, and on account of

[16] It does not seem that there is any deliberate perversion in the later Authorized Version; and certainly not in the Revised Version.

"our poor estate in banishment". They had taken the authentic Latin Vulgate text throughout, and endeavored to give a literal rendering of the words and a faithful rendering of the sense, seeking enlightenment on occasion from Hebrew and Greek texts. Nothing was done "either untruly or obscurely on purpose in favour of the Roman Catholic religion, so that we cannot but complain and challenge English Protestants for corrupting the text . . . which they profess to translate".

The resulting work was an English Bible of unquestionable accuracy and fidelity, against which no charge of theological bias or prejudice has ever been seriously leveled by any scholar. The only faults to be found were those due to the excessive fidelity and literalness of the translation in many places, and the introduction of Latinisms for which no English equivalent seemed to present itself. In subsequent editions, various attempts were made to eliminate these literary defects and to modernize or render less antiquated the spelling and phraseology.

The Rheims New Testament had no little influence on the Protestant Authorised Version of 1611, which itself was freely used by Dr. Challoner in the very thorough revisions of the Douay Bible made between 1749 and 1777. Dr. Challoner's work was well-intentioned, but while smoothing out the ruggedness of the Elizabethan translators, it sacrificed much of their vigor and often weakened their nervous and forcible English, which is regrettable, as this is the revision now universally in use among English-speaking Catholics.

W. SHARP, S.J.

Oxford, England.

SELECTED READING LISTS.

BY CATHOLIC AUTHORS.

Barry, W., *The Tradition of Scripure.*

Chapman, H. J., O.S.B., "The Latin Bible" (in the *Dublin Review,* Jan. and April, 1927).

Gigot, F. E., *General Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures.*

Grannan, C. P., *A General Introduction to the Bible.*

Lattey, C., S.J., *First Notions of Holy Writ.*

Newman, Card., "Text of Rheims and Douay Version of Holy Scripture" (in the *Rambler,* July, 1859). Reprinted in *Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical.*)

Pollen, J. H., S.J., "Translating the Bible into English at Rheims" (in the *Month*, Aug., 1922).

Pope, T., O.P., *The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Bible.* "The Origin of the Douay Bible" (in the *Dublin Review*, July, 1910). "The Rheims Version of the New Testament" (in the *Dublin Review*," April, 1913).

Carleton, J. G., *Rheims and the English Bible.*

Smith, S. F., S.J., "Our English Catholic Bible" (in the *Month*, June and July, 1897).

NON-CATHOLIC.

Gregory, C. R., *The Canon and Text of the New Testament.*

Kenyon, F. C., *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. Textual Criticism of the New Testament.*

Milligan, G., *The New Testament Documents.*

Ottley, R. R., *A Handbook to the Septuagint.*

Pells, S. F., *The Great Texts of the Bible and our English Translations.*

Schaff, P., *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version.*

THE CONNEXION BETWEEN CLASSICAL, PATRISTIC AND MEDIEVAL LATIN.

DISCUSSION of a question like this must necessarily start with a definition of terms. Connexion is to be understood in the widest possible sense. "Classical" means many things. The word may be used in the narrow sense of the four prose writers, Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, and Nepos. Whatever definition of the word the Renaissance scholars may have given, their practice suggests that it meant pagan, non-Christian, with a slight concession to Christian Latin verse, these students having been primarily interested in what we call *belles-lettres*. In the following sketch it will be used in a chronological sense, and taken to include all Latin literature written prior to about A. D. 130, and all non-Christian literature, like the poems of Claudian, written later than that. The word "patristic" also requires definition. Strictly used, it would refer only to the writings of those technically called Fathers of the Church. But for an investigation like the present, it is convenient, and not unusual, to comprise within this term the Latin Scriptures, and also the writings of Christian

authors like Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, and other heretics, Cassiodorus, etc., who are not really Fathers of the Church in any true sense. Here again the temporal division is the only safe one; let us, therefore, take the period A. D. 130 to 735 (death of the Venerable Bede) as the period of patristic Latin. The medieval period will then be defined as the seven centuries which followed Bede's death and ended with the invention of printing.

The connexion between these three periods of Latin is necessarily a very real one, but there is a very great difference between the third and the other two. The first and second share the peculiarity that large numbers of ordinary little-educated people spoke the Latin language during their course. The third is distinguished by the fact that, while the Latin language remained a *lingua franca,* it was only among the educated that it had currency. It follows from this fact that, though literature is always artificial, as contrasted with speech, it is more artificial than ever in the medieval period.

If we desire to understand the connexion between classical and patristic Latin, we must first note three differences between them. The first is that in the interval of four hundred years during which the major part of classical literature was written, the language itself grew greatly, and became the speech of a vastly larger number of people. The second is that it shows two strands. On the one hand, we have the language of Plautus, some of Cicero's correspondence, the Pseudo-Caesarian writings, Petronius, and much of Seneca and the elder Pliny, approximating more or less close to the popular, contemporary speech; on the other we have a highly artificial product, of consummate literary excellence, seen in writers like Terence, Cicero, etc., which sets up standards of diction definitely different from the popular speech, allowing a few of the distinctive elements of the latter, and eschewing others with horror. The creation of Latin prose is one of the most remarkable efforts in the history of the human mind, by which a few men, of whom Cicero was the greatest, endeavored to dictate to their fellows what was good literary Latin, and what was not. Such an effort could only have partial success as a permanency in the Latin language and literature. The third difference is really the most important of all. Behind the

classical Latin there was a genuine or pretended acceptance of the pagan religion on the one hand, or an Euhemeristic tendency, encouraged by Eunius and others, the practical effect of which was a religious skepticism. There was at the same time a wonderfully high standard of morality, evident particularly in the Stoic writings, but present also in the *De Officiis* of Cicero. But in the Christian writings we find a sincerity and earnestness, behind which lies faith in Christ and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It is this element above all which differentiates the second from the first period, and makes much of the earlier literature elegant trifling by the side of the second.

Yet the second period does depend in a great measure on the first. In the first place the teaching of the schools was on the whole uniform. Christians and pagans alike read Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Lucan, and Juvenal. In Tertullian and Augustine we find Varro's *Antiquitates* and other works very largely exploited. Jerome cannot hide his knowledge of Cicero, Sallust, Virgil, and Horace, despite all his efforts to *Christianus* rather than *Ciceronianus*. Augustine's indebtedness to Cicero, Virgil, Lucan, is evident to all readers. The cultural basis of the patristic period is then the knowledge of the chief Latin writers of the early days. And added to this, there is the linguistic connexion between the two periods, though, indeed it is somewhat artificial to draw a sharp distinction between literary and linguistic.

It is difficult to be explicit with regard to the linguistic connexion apart from the literary. We have already enumerated the writers of the classical period, in whose Latin popular elements abound. When we come to the Latin Scriptures, we find similar popular elements in abundance. As I believe, the earliest Latin translations of the Bible were made by Greeks for Latins who did not understand Greek. These versions were of necessity popular in character. But the question that causes difficulty is this. Are any of the popular elements in the Latin of the Bible and of the Fathers due to the influence of Fronto and his followers, the deliberate resuscitators of ancient colloquial words and phrases, or must we suppose that all—as certainly most—of these elements are due to the fact that many popular elements remained in speech from Plautus

to Apuleius and later, even though they make no appearance in literature during an interval of over three hundred years? Whatever be the truth about this, we must recognize a cultural basis in the least educated of the patristic writers, in inverse proportion to the amount of colloquial Latin preserved by them. In a writer like Jerome or Augustine, the cultural element is proportionately higher, and the popular element lower. Yet in Augustine himself we find several styles and both he and Jerome approximate to the popular in the language of their sermons.

I have as yet said nothing of literary forms, as apart from language. Here the dependence is really much greater. The historians like Jerome and Orosius have to depend largely on pagan sources. For example, Jerome's Chronicle depends in part at least on Suetonius, while Orosius used *inter alia* some epitome of Livy. Moral treatises, like Ambrose's *De Officiis,* depend largely on Cicero's earlier work. The sermons of the Christian bishops are powerfully influenced by the teaching of the pagan rhetorical schools, and by such forms as the diatribe. In poetry the influence is even more conspicuous. Sidonius Apollinaris is steeped in Statius; Orator knows his Lucan; Prudentius is a highly cultivated writer, who follows the models of the past, while striking out on new lines of his own, like the other hymn writers. Here, however, one must not overlook the new literary form seen in such works as Augustine's Anti-Donatist verses and the curious poems of Commodian.

To sum up this age. The patristic writers have the same language and the same cultural backgrounds, very much the same literary forms, but in varying proportions they admit ancient and important popular words and phrases, which were eschewed by purists like Cicero and his imitators.

In the medieval period we find numerous literary forms. The parody was quite well-known to the earlier periods, but it finds a very great development in this period, as Lehman's publication shows. Yet this is the humblest of all literary forms. The most distinctive product of the medieval period is the scholastic philosophy. Much of this is based on the translations made by Joannes Scotus Erigena (in the ninth century) from the Greek writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the

Areopagite. The medieval period is distinguished for chronicles, biographical dictionaries, and encyclopedias also. St. Augustine's Confessions is the parent of much medieval devotional literature. The chronicles are mainly associated with monasteries, and it is not too fanciful to trace this form through Jerome to the old *Annales* and *Libri Lintei* of the early days of Rome. If Suetonius, again, served as the model for Jerome's *De Viris Inlustribus,* and Gennadius was influenced by the latter, both assuredly influenced Isidore, and Isidore in turn must have been an element in the inspiration of Trithemius in the medieval period.

Perhaps the two most powerful influences on the greatest writers of this period were the translations of Aristotle into Latin from Arabic and the writings of Augustine. Aristotle and Augustine were, in fact, the two poles round which the philosophical thought of the Middle Ages turned. The influence of the first is seen in the Schoolmen, of the second in Fathers like Bonaventure and Bernard of Clairvaux. The medieval period was of course vastly more influenced by the patristic than by the classical Latin. The real Dark Ages begin on the Continent about 600 and last till 800. During that period the classics were hardly copied, and this break in their influence had a lasting effect on the intellectual outlook of the Middle Ages. The influence of Charles the Great led to the copying of many classical writings, which were read in the larger monasteries. But there was a gradual decay of such knowledge until we come to the twelfth century, when there was a revival particularly of patristic writings. The classical influence on the medieval period does not appear great till about the end, when the enthusiastic searchers for classics like Poggio Bracciolini and Niccolo Niccoli, under the impetus of Petrarch, inaugurated a revival of their influence, which is so far from having spent itself that the position of the classics is more hopeful to-day than it has been for about forty years.

JOSEPH P. CHRISTOPHER

Catholic University of America.

IS THE CHURCH OCCIDENTALIZED?

IN the high hills of New Mexico one night, outside a log cabin amongst the piñons, the talk waxed and waned "of cabbages and kings," or rather of national cultures and Catholicity. The problem of the reunion of the schismatic Oriental groups had been discussed, and then the work of European and American missionaries in India, China, and the Far East generally. Suddenly, like an unexpected bomb, the following difficulty was dropped into the till then desultory eddies of conversation.

"The Church will never be entirely successful in the East until she has become deoccidentalized." Silence followed—while pipes were drawn hard until they glowed red in the dark.

"You imply, then, that the Church has been occidentalized?" inquired a voice finally, as its owner relaxed back into a creaking camp chair.

"Yes,—in the sense that the Church, through her age-long growth amongst and association with the peoples of Europe, has acquired a local, almost national, coloring, which is foreign and distasteful to the peoples of the East. It is too intimately associated with the thing called European culture, which the missionaries have no call to impose on, say, the heathen Chinee, at the same time that they impart legitimately the teaching of the Gospel."

* * *

The difficulty is a serious one, involving a fundamental attribute of the Church not only in practice but in principle. For its solution one may first of all go back to the very beginnings of the Kingdom of Heaven, and argue that as in those days the Church resolutely resisted being Judaized, so she has never since been occidentalized. Thereupon it is time to examine what really constitutes that quality of the Church which the objector considered an extraneous accretion and succinctly phrased as "occidentalization."

The greatest crisis which the organization founded by Christ for the supernaturalization of man ever passed through happened in the very first century of its existence, nay, not fifty years after the day of Pentecost. It was naught else but the persistent, generally well-meant, endeavor of many and influential Judeo-Christians to impose on the whole Church as

an obligation their own specifically Hebrew rites and observances, such as circumcision, *kosher* foods and purifications.

To these of course the recent converts had been accustomed from their childhood, either in Palestine itself or in the ghettoes of the Greek cities of the *diasporá*. And, let it be understood, these men were real Christians, although of the Hebrew race. They had been baptized. They sincerely believed that Christ was in truth the Messias. One can even see a view of their contention which makes it appear harmless and almost praiseworthy. As Hebrews they were, of course and without fault, ardent nationalists. They loved their own people and the land which had once been theirs and now was Roman territory. Their eyes had been opened to the truth and advantages of Christianity. They desired all their conationals to share therein with themselves. Nevertheless there were already many Gentile Christians. Social intercourse with the uncircumcized was an abomination to the Jew. Hence arose a great obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity by the bulk of the Hebrews. Could not this obstacle be removed?

The Judeo-Christians themselves had never been asked to give up the practice of the ancient Mosaic observances. Circumcision, washings, *kosher* foods, were in themselves indifferent matters. They had come down from hoary antiquity as the peculiar mark and treasure of God's Chosen People. The Apostles themselves, not even excluding St. Paul (who boasted of being "a Hebrew of the Hebrews"), did not distain their observance. Christ during His lifetime had indeed opposed and attacked the absurd and unreasonable Pharisaic deformations of the Mosaic ceremonial code,—but He had never denounced its reasonable observance by the Jews. Hence also afterward the first converts from Judaism had not been molested in keeping up the practices characteristic of their nationality. For, this indeed was what the observance of these ritual regulations had come to be: a badge of nationality.

Now these newly converted Hebrews, whether from inbred prejudices or from a laudable desire of facilitating the entry of their conationals into the Church, proposed that that which had been a courteous concession for themselves should be made an onerous obligation for their fellow Christians of Gentile origin. Alas! How often in the world's history have not privileges generously granted been similarly abused?

But, fortunately, one man amongst the leaders of the early Christian organization, himself chosen by God to be the "Apostle of the Gentiles," saw more clearly than some of his fellows in high position the eventual fatal effects of this policy —and fought it in season and out until it was scotched. What? To oblige every Christian to be circumcized, what would that mean but that he should become a Hebrew? And, what would this policy result in except that the Church, God's world-wide Kingdom just starting to spread, should be—not catholic, universal, adapted to men of all climes and times and nationalities, but—Jewish, conforming to the demands of a single nationality? How could the apostolic missionaries going forth from Palestine into various countries, proclaim as necessary for eternal salvation the adoption of the Christian creed if this last were also to imply that their hearers forswear their own patriotism and adopt the national practices of the Hebrews?

Had this policy—of whose insidious harmfulness many of the Church leaders were not aware at first, probably because of their own Hebrew origin and inclination—been adopted, the Church Universal would quickly have atrophied and degenerated into an obscure Jewish sect. The foresight and eloquence of St. Paul, as definitely embodied in the decision of the First Council at Jerusalem, (which but added temporary suggestions to allay Hebrew prejudice and facilitate social intercourse) prevented the subordination of the Church to the customs and practices of one nationality, and thereby immediately set its doors wide open for the reception of the Western peoples and, eventually, all the rest of the world.

At its very beginning, therefore, in face of enormous difficulties from the natural inclination of its leaders, and despite the probable loss of a whole nation to the Faith, the Church refused to be judaized. Can it be true, then, that in these latter days the Church has, through leaning over backward as it were, fallen into opposite error and become occidentalized? Certain phases of her modern missionary work seem at first sight to warrant such suspicion.

The missionaries sent out to the Orient and Africa, the two great heathen territories remaining in the world, are they not mostly Europeans, with the European's practices and prejudices? And will they not, even unconsciously, strive to im-

plant in their dusky converts, besides the teachings of Christianity, also the habits and customs of Europeans? And is it not the design of many an Occidental nation in protecting and encouraging missionaries in its Oriental dependencies or protectorates, that a market be created for its products and a base secured for its imperialistic domination? Besides the essential and necessary Christian doctrine, will not Western missionaries unjustifiably try to force Occidental national idiosyncrasies upon the poor heathen? Hence, must not the Church be de-occidentalized before it can be quite successful in its evangelization of the Orient?

These are serious difficulties—almost accusations. And the present writer has never been one to advocate the imposition of the *Kultur* of Birmingham on Bombay, or of the bathtubs of Peoria on Pekin, or to relish the recruiting of Rotarians in Rhodesia.

On the other hand it is undeniable that European nationals (and, more lately, their American counterparts) have, in regard to the heathen (I do not say necessarily barbarous) peoples of the Orient and Africa, felt themselves obligated to an attitude of superiority and patronage, delicately intimated by the vague but effective phrase: "the white man's burden." The European, be he Catholic or Protestant, when placed in a heathen territory, realizes that he has something, principles of conduct or prerogatives of caste, in which the natives of his environment, no matter how cultured, are lacking. Thereupon he insists upon the public recognition of this consciousness of his. Nay more, he labors to the end that his code of conduct become that of his new neighbors. And, strange to say, at first the invader's or visitor's idiosyncrasy is deferred to. His standard is even deemed desirable of acquisition, or at least of imitation, by the natives. The heathen peoples seem to sense that here is something which it might benefit them to attain for themselves. In short, European culture has become an ambition of the Orient.

What is the explanation of this unexpected paradox militating against the earlier difficulties? And what is the real answer to these difficulties?

The solution has been stated succinctly by Belloc: The Faith is Europe, and Europe is the Faith. It is not that the Faith,

Christianity, the Church, has been occidentalized, but that Europe has been christianized. It is not that Europe made the Church what it is, but that the Church made Europe. In the dispositions of God for the spread of His Kingdom it seems to have been decreed (if one may reverently peer into the designs of Providence) that the Church should first of all leaven and permeate the peoples and races of the Occident—peoples as diverse and antagonistic in racial characteristics as any of the Orient—and should weld them, despite their national divergencies, into a more or less homogeneous whole on the basis of common essential religious beliefs and a code of conduct.

This cultural unity of Europe was most visible in the Middle Ages, when the pilgrim from Upsala was at home in Rome, and the scholar from Naples taught in the halls of Oxford. And this cultural (one should really say: religious unity, for the two are identical) unity was not destroyed entirely by the separatist upheaval of the 16th century, although it was seriously weakened and ruptured. The agglomeration of sects known as Protestant remained basically or at least nominally Christian. Lutheran and Calvinist and Episcopalian with all their varied subspecies claimed membership in God's Kingdom. Having once enjoyed the full fruits of Christianity they were loath to give them up. Therefore, quite illogically perhaps, nevertheless tenaciously, they clung to the outward and visible signs of Christianity even when they frequently denied and were lacking its interior and invisible principle. As (according to the conjectures of some exegetes) the longevity of the antediluvian patriarchs was due to Adam's having in Paradise partaken of the fruit of the Life-Tree which fended off physical decay, so did the Protestant sects for almost a world-cycle of 400 years maintain the feeling and bearing of Christianity from the principles they had imbibed at the breast of their Mother, the Church Catholic,—of whom they had now become rebellious children, but were children nevertheless.

Thus did it come about that an English Episcopalian or a French Catholic or a Dutch Calvinist or a German Lutheran or a Scotch Presbyterian, setting foot far from home on heathen soil, nevertheless could fraternize with his fellows of other

European nationalities and religious persuasions, and coöperate with them (antagonistic though they might be in national ambitions) for the imposition and maintenance of "the white man's prestige"—which is essentially not the Caucasian's but the Christian's prestige or superiority over the non-Christian. The profession (if not always the practice) of Christianity formed a common meeting ground.

Why at present is official Soviet Russia, although rich in the appurtenances of material civilization, considered as a pariah amongst the peoples of civilization? And why is Japan, with all its glossy veneer of Occidental accomplishments, looked at askance? Because the former officially and the latter factually is not Christian. And why, in the United States, have the negroes, an African, most alien, race, been assimilated into at least theoretic and official equality in civic rights? Because that group has become Christian. They are none the less African racially, and will remain so for their own good and that of their neighbors.

No, the Church is still universal, Catholic,—and not a specifically European institution. That which is Europe and the basic essentials of its culture, called "civilization," has been formed in the womb of the Church. Christ is its father. And, it can not help but bear the lineaments of its parents. These lineaments, even though distorted at times, will be impressed on every race, white, black, red, or yellow, where Christianity's principles, either directly through the Church or indirectly through one of its errant children, become the mainsprings of society. Variety of race in the unity of belief constitutes the majestic beauty of her whom the prophetic Psalmist characterized as "the King's daughter *circumdata varietate.*" In her there is, according to the saying of St. Paul, "neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free,—but Christ is all in all."

This superiority of the Church to time and place, which she underwent such terrific struggle to maintain at her very beginning in St. Paul's time, has been the one attribute for which she has had to fight most constantly since. Often her own purblind children were her worst enemies in this. State after state, at some time or other in its history, has striven to nationalize the Church. The great Oriental schism arose from the

desire of the Greek emperors to dominate it. It is most noteworthy that the seceding groups of the 16th century immediately stagnated into State churches. One is almost tempted to say that this danger of State domination is all the greater for the Church in countries whose people are predominantly Catholic, where the Church receives the official recognition and support of the State. For, in return the State too often exacts for itself rights of intervention and control in ecclesiastical matters, which become the opening point of the wedge for an attempt at domination. Witness Gallicanism and Josephism and the continual bickering over concordats.

The Powers of Evil warring against the Church have again and again chosen an artificial State church as the means of their attack—the "False Prophet" of the Apocalypse. Witness the "Living Church" lately organized by the anti-christion leaders of Soviet Russia. And, is not the Mexican governing *junta* striving to subordinate the Church there, with its expulsion of all non-Mexican ministers of religion in the expectation of getting the native priests and hierarchy to bow to its bidding? Was not a schismatic "patriarch" and "church" fostered by Calles? What are alleged by short-sighted historians to be cases of the Church's domineering over the State, will on close and impartial examination generally turn out to be instances where the State tried to mix into ecclesiastical matters,—very often for the exploitation and oppression of the common people.

Then when the Church, true to its tradition from the days of St. Paul, refused to be nationalized, refused to become the tool of tyrants for the destruction of the rights and liberties of the weak, the ignorant and the poor, the rallying cry of "Church interference!" was raised by those whose ambitious and selfish plots were foiled.

* * *

The prevailing danger is not that Christian missionaries will denationalize the Oriental peoples,—unless the removal of sin, crime, injustice, impurity, and of all the other evil consectaries of heathenism be deemed denationalization. Nor will the Church fail in her program of evangelization of the Orient and Africa just because her missionaries are panoplied in the principles and practices of civilization. For, civilization is essen-

tially Christianity, which, through Divine disposition, came to flowering and fruiting in the region of various nationalities now unified and grouped as Europe. In Belloc's phrase: "The Faith is Europe and Europe is the Faith." What is known as "European civilization" is not a racial or national but an ecclesiastical and Christian inheritance and development. The Church is not occidental just because the Occident haply is Christian. Consequently the Church does not need to be de-occidentalized in order that the Orient be Christianized.

JOHN-MARY SIMON, O.S.M.

Caliente, Nevada.

MENTAL AND SPIRITUAL CURES.

II. Healing Religions and their Cures.

IN the preceding article I discussed the question of the number of healing religions that we have in this country and certain of the severe diseases that they are supposed to cure. It must not be forgotten that the evidence for these cures represents the best support that these healing religions have. Without the cures their followers would not believe in them and above all would not pay the liberal sums of money which they now give because the evidence for the cures convinced them that in these religions there must be a direct healing dispensation from on High. I have discussed the evidence for some of these cures and shown how fallacious it may be and I have pointed out that the death rate for instance from cancer among the followers of Mrs. Eddy and so-called Christian Science as well as of New Thought and other healing religions is just as high as it is among the rest of the population. This is true for any other form of serious and chronic diseases of later life which are now so much more common than they used to be, having actually increased during the generation when Christian Science and the other healing religions have been gaining a foothold.

It is true that only occasionally are claims made on the part of these healing religions for the cure of cancer and ills such as Brights' disease, heart disease, arterial disease, liver disease and the like. These are ever so much commoner now because we

have lengthened life by over twenty years during the past generation and ever so many more people are living on to the age where they acquire these diseases. Perhaps it would be too much to expect that the so-called healing religions would have much effect on these, or lower the death rate among their devotees to any notable extent. It might possibly be expected however that these healing religions would lessen the amount of suffering among mankind and there are a great many of their devotees who will tell you very emphatically that they do so. They will assure you that they have heard people proclaim that while life used to be a matter of ever-recurring pains and aches, it has now become not only tolerable but satisfying.

That brings us to that problem so interesting for many people and so difficult for some at least to understand that pains and aches are subjective. If you cut the nerve between an injured finger and the brain there will be no feeling of the injury. It is the brain that does the feeling and not the part to which the pain is referred and yet the brain itself can be cut without pain because it has no sensory nerves.

The Diseases that are Cured.

It is interesting in the light of this to note that the cures made by healing religions occur in affections which include pains and aches in muscles and joints. These cases appear so essentially physical in their character that it seems quite impossible that mere mental influences may cure them. Yet they belong to the class of cases that have been "cured" by all sorts of absurd things in the history of medicine.

Lumbago, for instance, that is pains in the large group of muscles in the regions called the loins which enable us to stoop and bend and twist has given currency to a larger number of remedies than almost any other affection. Many of these have attracted attention because of the relief afforded by them. The patients are great complainers. Everyone who is acquainted with them knows of their ills, and then they tell just as volubly of their cure in order to substantiate their previous reports of their pains and aches. After apparently working many cures of chronic cases that have made the rounds of physicians for years, these remedies have proved to be utterly incapable of doing any good of any kind for lumbago. When

magnets were introduced and for several years were looked upon as the most important therapeutic agent that we had, it was because a large horseshoe magnet made at the university of Vienna about a century and a half ago had cured a patient who had been treated without avail by all of the distinguished professors of medicine in the medical school—and at that moment Vienna had the best medical school in the world. As a result of this and subsequent "cures" magnets were made in the shape of various organs, the heart and the kidneys, the liver. All sorts of diseases were cured by them for a while, and then after a time they cured nothing. There is no power in the magnet that affects human tissues at all but the number of people who were "cured" by them was legion.

A full century later when hypnotism had been in disgrace for nearly a generation it secured a vogue in the modern world because of the cure of a case of lumbago. Bernheim at Nancy had a patient suffering from lumbago for whom he could do nothing. He had tried everything in his armamentarium. He met the man some months later and by this time he was perfectly well. He asked the patient what had benefited him and the patient replied that he had gone to Liebeault and been hypnotized and his lumbago disappeared. That single case brought hypnotism into use at the end of the nineteenth century and a great many physicians were sure that it represented a wonderful curative agent though now of course we know that hypnotism is only induced hysteria and that hysteria is only supersuggestibility. Hypnotism makes one amenable to suggestion and suggestion alters one's attitude of mind toward oneself and his ills. Thus "cures" are affected.

Many who suffer from lumbago carry canes or crutches because they do not trust themselves. Not a few wear some sort of support for the back. All such things are abandoned by sufferers when for any reason their condition is improved. When Elisha Perkins invented what he called his tractors, supposed to carry both magnetism and electricity, he cured a very large number of chronic cases of lumbago, sciatica, lame shoulders and lame backs that had been making the rounds of physicians for years. Such patients are very well known. They are loud in their complaints. Everybody has seen and heard them. When they are cured it is assumed that some

wonderful mode of healing must have been used. As a matter of fact they get better because of a changed attitude of mind. Lumbago cases have actually been cured by wearing a sheet of writing paper next the skin of the back kept in place by a belt.

These cases have been cured by acupuncture, that is by putting needles into them. At first it was thought that the curative effect was due to nervous reactions after the needle puncture. Then it was attributed to the fact that the needles in some way brought about an equilibrium of electrical forces within the muscles. Other elaborate theories of their curative effects were suggested. It was found that the only curative agent was the mental influence due to plunging a pair of needles deeply into the part. In the same way injections of alcohol or other fluids, even distilled water, were made into the sheathes of nerves with like good results. In fact any means of giving the patient convincing hope led to a cure. All sorts of plasters have been invented which have done good to certain people. In most of these the principal element has been the rubber which made them stick. The amount of medicament on them is almost negligible. Some of these plasters have had a reputation for years and have been often declared effective. Since anything else that convinced the patient that he was being cured, led to his betterment, physicians have been rather skeptical about the physical influence of any of these cures.

Whenever symptoms in the body follow a fright they are always practically the result of a psychoneurosis, that is a mental state or disturbance of the psyche which leads to a lack of control over the nerves or a neurosis. In the old days these cases when they followed a railroad accident were often called "railway spine". The spine is so complex a structure that there has always been the feeling that it might be injured readily but as a matter of fact nature has made the spinal column such a marvelous structure that only crushing violence will disturb it as a rule. Mrs. Eddy herself, was cured of one of these spinal neuroses due to a fall on the ice. Her healer was the famous Dr. Phineas Quimby to whom New Thought, another healing faith, traces its origin. When these indefinite conditions followed an injury which was usually not severe but which had produced an intense scare, the condition was called

a traumatic neurosis. During the war army surgeons had experience with a large number of these cases and at the beginning when they were as yet unfamiliar with them, they were called "shell shock". It was supposed that the lack of control over the nerves was due to some concussion of the central nervous system, that is an intense shaking-up of the elements that go to make up the brain and spinal cord so that their connections were interrupted or impaired in some way, with the result that nervous lack of control almost necessarily followed. They were attributed to concussion of the brain or sometimes concussion of the spine or were thought, especially when they gave external symptoms, to be due to concussion of the sympathetic nervous system which lies within the abdomen running along the spinal column at the back of the abdominal cavity.

Further experience in the war however developed a number of these cases in soldiers who had never been within a hundred miles of an exploding shell. It then came to be realized very clearly that the lack of nervous control was due to the scare or over-solicitude. Some individuals are so constituted that they cannot stand the intense feeling of danger which war involves. They lose control over their nervous systems and develop all sorts of symptoms. Some of them lose the power to see, a few are unable to hear, quite a number cannot talk or cannot talk above a whisper and then not a few of them develop tremors and lameness and painful conditions of various kinds, and some of them complain of internal troubles which would seem surely to be organic. It has been said that psychoneurosis can simulate the symptoms of practically all disease so far as these may be exhibited in the nervous system. There were jerking movements and tremors of various kinds and above all, disturbances of sensation and they had hyperesthetic patches and areas of anesthesia and very often their conjunctiva, that is the sensitive outer covering of the eye, had lost its sensitivity and the back of the throat was quite insensitive so that the handle of a spoon could be pushed back there without producing any serious reaction.

These psychoneuroses often last for a long while but they are all curable by a change in the attitude of mind. Over and over again neurologists have declared with regard to them that "This is the sort of patient that is cured by some new-fangled

religion or by some supposed wonder-working physical remedy." When the Leyden jar was first introduced, such patients were cured by a series of sparks from that rather surprising electrical apparatus which represented the first condenser of electricity that we possessed. Later they were cured by electrical machines even when these were only little toys that we would laugh at now. People suffering from the psychoneuroses in mild form have been known to be cured by wearing an "electric" belt or an "electric" medal or even an "electric" ring. Needless to say, they did not contain an ion of electricity. They are called electric and are made to simulate electrical apparatus by being composed of different metals. "Electric" insoles have been known to do a great deal of good to patients who complained of their feet because it was said that there was a flow of electricity from the zinc to the copper which ran up one leg and down the other. There is no such electric current but the idea of it was sufficient to effect cures.

The psychoneuroses have made the fortunes of any number of quacks and charlatans but they have also given vogue to all sorts of religious ideas. When "spirit rapping" so-called as practised at Hydesville in New York gradually became converted into mediumistic spiritualism, cures of "cured" devotees became one of the strongest bits of evidence for the alleged demonstration of communication with the spirit world. Any number of people were cured of all sorts of ills especially chronic pains and aches and lameness of legs and shoulders and arms by prescriptions from the spirit world. One of the early very successful masters of spirit communication was Andrew Jackson Davis, the so-called Seer of Poughkeepsie, who used to go into trances and dictate books by spiritistic inspiration. His books sold in almost as many editions as Mrs. Eddy's in the modern time though almost needless to say there was much less market for books in those days than now, nearly a hundred years later. According to his own story, Andrew Jackson Davis met Galen, the great Greek physician, who was the physician to the emperor Marcus Aurelius, and Swedenborg, the Swedish mystic, one night in a graveyard. That would seem to be a rather ominous place to get information with regard to the cure of disease but ac-

cording to Davis' story Galen taught him how to diagnose disease and Swedenborg taught him how to treat it.

No wonder then that after that experience he was able to diagnose successfully and treat with absolute assurance of cure any affection or patient that might be brought to him. He had the wisdom of the ages behind him, refined as necessarily it must have been by having passed through the alembic of the other world. Certainly he cured a great many people and above all a great many chronic cases that the physicians had been unable to cure. People came to him using crutches and went away without them. He attracted so much attention that he actually came to be looked upon shortly before the Civil War as a particular channel of favors from on High for our country. He was taken down to Washington and his reputation as a healer having preceded him, he was invited to address the Senate and he was listened to with rapt attention. Indeed there was question for a time of making him a sort of physician extraordinary to the United States Senate if not to the country at large. Fortunately Senator Shields, the Irishman who holds the very enviable distinction of having been a Senator from three different states of the Union, was present and had his sense of humor with him, and through his efforts we were spared the stigma of any official recognition of the Seer of Poughkeepsie.

There were a number of others about this time who were supposed to be in communication with the spirits of the world and to be inspired by them for the healing of disease. As a result spiritualism spread in one form or another all over the country. The cures that were made were as largely responsible for this, as the marvelous communications which the mediums were supposed to secure from their spirit controls on the other shore. They cured always the same classes of patients. Nervous women of course who had been suffering from unbearable headaches for years or from other pains and aches and who as a result of the persistence of their symptoms had been quite sure that they were the victims of some incurable internal disease, were the favorite candidates for cure. After them came elderly men with lame backs and lame shoulders who had not been able to work for months or sometimes even for years, and whose "cures" created a mild sensa-

tion. Then people who had been involved in accidents of various kinds and who though but little injured if at all, had never been able to assure themselves that something serious had not happened to them. This experience affected control over the nervous system so that they were almost helpless until spiritistic medical aid came to relieve them. These and similar cases were all cured by prescriptions from the spirits or directions of one kind or another with regard to physicians or healers. Even in our day Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, who it should be recalled is—or was—a physician says that a medium directed his sister-in-law to a healer who cured her after doctors had proved unable to do anything for her. This was some sort of magnetic healer. There is the certainty that the effects produced were mental not physical.

Human nature does not change from generation to generation nor does education make much difference. Indeed most educated people in our time seem to be rendered more suggestible than they were before, that is to say they rather easily become believers in all sorts of extraordinary manifestations that are supposed to be of therapeutic efficiency. If they are religiously inclined and yet have worked themselves out of belief in Christianity, they are prone to accept new-fangled healing religions on the evidence of their own experience or because friends have been healed of long-standing symptoms. It is very well known that members of the old families of America, especially those with any tendency to literary aspirations, are not orthodox in their attitude toward physicians and progressive medical science. New England particularly has been the great nourisher of healing sects. Spiritualism in its palmy days, New Thought as it is called, Eddyism and similar divagations of the religious spirit are not so well known outside of New England. People are looking not for the salvation of their souls but for the salvation of their bodies. The word *salus* in Latin means both health and salvation and the body has now become ever so much more interesting and important for a great many people than the soul.

It is in the large cities particularly that we have the religious healers. They occupy the parlors or ballrooms of the large hotels on Sunday afternoons or evenings and they attract a goodly number of people because of their promise of healing.

Many of them make a fine living. It is "cured cases" always that bring other patients to a physician or to a healer. When we find crowds of devotees or patients, we can be sure that a number of applicants have already proclaimed themselves "cured" of long-standing ills. Together with religious healing they appeal to such esoteric ideas as are concealed beneath the words psychology and metaphysics, in order to attract the attention of rationalists who no longer believe in a God. And their great standby is divine healing which they proclaim Christ intended to continue after His time. He set the example in His day by healing many with whom He came in contact. Thus they claim to follow His example more closely than other people and therefore on them is conferred the power of healing the sick in Christ's name. There are many varieties of the religion of the healing Christ, and a large number of people are sure that they have witnessed the wondrous power of Christ still persistent among those who believe devoutly in the power that makes for good rather than for evil in life.

Some of these manifestations of healing are very curious, and it would seem quite impossible that rational, educated and somewhat intelligent individuals in our enlightened time,—as we like to think of it,—could become devotees of the cults associated with them. I once went to hear a man preach at a fashionable hotel in New York what he called the Religion of the Solar Plexus. The solar plexus is that important collection of nerves which occupies a place just behind the stomach and over the backbone in the abdominal region. It is so complex in its composition that it is sometimes spoken of as the abdominal brain and it represents the centre of the sympathetic nervous system. A blow over it, as pugilists know, is apt to fell a man. The high priest of the new religion of the solar plexus told us that we had a god within us. The Latin expression, *est Deus in nobis,* "there is a God within us", was quoted in order to give absolute emphasis to this. We were further told that we should not believe in a god outside of us and above all not a god whom we could reach only through ministers and priests with the expenditure of money but a god who was intimately related to us. He himself did not claim any such title as priest or minister, he was but a guide to be followed—for a consideration of course.

If we would only devote ourselves to this god within us, we were told that new vitality and conscious force would flow into every part of our being and would correct whatever was wrong in our functions and even modify any organic degeneration so favorably that our ills would disappear and we would be not only well but strong and healthy. There was an implied promise that this new health due to the proper worship of the solar plexus would also bring prosperity in its train. It was all a question of proper devotion to our solar plexus.

There were nearly a hundred people present at this service of praise of the god within us, the solar plexus. Some of the ladies at least were manifestly on terms of the most lively intimacy with the pastor of this new religion. He had special hours for consultation during the week so that people might have the advantage of his advice in bringing the solar plexus properly into action in order to secure health and possibly wealth. The whole exercise was taken most seriously. The guide and friend was a glib talker. He knew how to use long worlds intelligently. He was manifestly securing results, for he was living in an expensive suite in the hotel in which his lectures were given.

Cures, *cures,* CURES, we have them all around us. Most of them appeal to the religious element in our generation. In spite of infidelity, man is incurably religious. Manifestly there is a great weakness of human nature in this direction of religious healing. It is extremely important then that we Catholics should not permit ourselves to be carried away by this easy self-deception. All the new-fangled religions appeal to "cures" as the demonstration of their direct connection with the healing power of divinity. It is perfectly easy to see that all of them are trading on the weakness of human nature. People often say to me, "Isn't it wonderful the way the mind cures the body," but I always say in reply that that is not what is wonderful at all. That is putting the cart before the horse, for the mind does not cure the body, but only symptoms that are produced by the mind. What is not realized as a rule is that this mind of ours can produce the symptoms of any disease in the body, not the disease itself. Whenever the mind produces the symptoms of the disease, only the mind can cure them. Many are by their dreads and fears of disease, their

worries and solicitude about themselves, constantly engaged in producing the symptoms of disease. They are cured by anything and everything that produces an effect on their minds.

There are two kinds of cures then, mental or mind cures, and spiritual cures. Mental cures are due to the fact that the mind corrects certain unfortunate impressions that the mental attitude has produced on the nervous system. Spiritual cures are due to intervention of a spirit quite other than ourselves and in the Catholic Church we believe that that spirit is God Himself. It is extremely important however not to get these two kinds of cures confused. There is a great tendency in human nature toward that fallacy. It is not always easy to distinguish between the two kinds of cures. Sometimes indeed it requires an expert physician to differentiate them. Hence the ease with which all sorts of bogus religions are able to bolster up their claims to be new revelations of the Divinity to man because of the cures they make.

Whenever Catholics set up the claim that the cures of what are manifestly only psychoneuroses (neurotic conditions which are cured by the mind because the mind has produced them) are miraculous exhibitions of the power of God, we invite such ridicule as naturally accrues to the preachers of bogus religions who claim that their mental healing is really a demonstration of the power of God. We now have so many healers that they are making religion both ridiculous and absurd.

If the Catholic Church is not critical in this matter of cures that it announces or permits to be announced, it will lose not a little of that prestige which it now holds among intelligent people who have cared to investigate the problem as representing the last stronghold of rational Christianity. This is an extremely important matter at the present time, for as the result of recent special studies in psychology we are manifestly coming to a *reductio ad absurdum* in the matter of religious healing.

Christ Himself set a very good example in this matter. One of His four evangelists, Luke, was a physician. For a time the fact of his being a physician was doubted during the nineteenth century but a triumphant vindication of the fact came from Ramsey, the English authority in Church history and

after him from no less an authority than Harnack in Germany. Harnack's volume on "Luke the Physician" makes it very clear that Luke was thoroughly in touch with the great Greek tradition in medicine between Hippocrates and Galen, and that he knew the scientific medicine of his time very well. Luke who is usually considered to have represented St. Paul in the writing of his gospel, took the stories of the miracles of the Lord and put them into medically scientific language. He took the ordinary terms for the various diseases the Lord had healed and expressed them in medical terms so as to make it perfectly clear for all time that the sufferers had been victims of organic disease of one kind or another and that the Lord in curing them had not merely produced mental effects on them but had worked real miracles of healing.

This precious example surely ought to be the model for our handling of this subject in the modern time. At the present moment it is extremely common to hear of cures supposed to be miracles that are manifestly only interesting but not very striking examples of the effect of the mind in curing symptoms that have been produced by the mind. How often do we hear of the cure of someone who has been injured in a railroad accident, though no bones were broken and no serious bruises inflicted but incapacity to walk and stand followed. Sometimes such injured people have been bedridden for weeks or months and then they are cured by some exercise of faith or religion. Manifestly this is not a wonder of healing but only a conventional cure of a psychoneurosis. I have known a woman who had been bedridden for several months after an elevated-railroad accident in which she was frightened. Except for some slight cuts by glass there was no further injury. She took to her bed and stayed there. Some months later when she felt herself quite incapable of standing or walking,—the familiar astasia-basia of the French neurologists—there was an alarm of fire and she was the first one down the stairs.

A great many of the "shell-shocked" soldiers suffered from blindness or dumbness for months. It was perfectly easy to assure oneself however that there was nothing organic the matter with them and that sometime or other they would recover both speech and sight perhaps as the result of suggestion. Hypnotism worked wonders on these cases a generation ago

when it was in vogue but now it scarcely cures anyone. Freudianism cured them for a while during the war when it was novel. It is no longer effective because it has not the same appeal to the mind. Occasionally one hears of cases of blindness or deafness or dumbness being cured at shrines or by the touch of a relic or some other exercise of devotion. That is perfectly possible but any such result should not be claimed to be miraculous. It is only an exemplification of the power of the mind to cure what the mind has produced.

Let us be sure then that we make the distinction very rigidly between mental and spiritual cures.

JAMES J. WALSH

New York City.

PERSONAL FALLACIES IN SPIRITUAL LIFE.

GOOD will alone gives uncertain promise of growth in spiritual life. But when right methods are associated with it, progress is much more satisfactory. When both good will and right methods are united in the service of a true personal ideal, the promise of spiritual progress is certain. If good will is united with bad judgment, disappointment awaits one. When efforts are made to meet situations in spiritual life as they arise from day to day, with no long outlook as guide, we may find goodness, but it is apt to be unstable and to lack force. An ill-tempered priest who merely wishes to avoid ill-tempered acts will use faulty methods if he fails to work systematically to reform his disposition. Unless he set before himself an ideal which will give measure, direction and value to effort he will flounder in his spiritual life and make no progress. He may still his conscience by telling himself that his will is good and then pay no attention whatever to the trait that enslaves him. Whatever the temptation against which one struggles, one must bring good will, approved methods and a determined purpose to the winning of spiritual victory.

Good methods in spiritual life are in large measure the dictates of common sense. Now common sense, sometimes defined as the least common kind of sense, is nothing other than objective judgment; ability to take into account all of the factors in a situation, to rate them at their real values and to

direct action by them. If one is working in wood, common sense demands that one understand wood. If one is working with steel, one must know its qualities and deal with them. If one is attempting to transform temperament, to put the imprint of Christ upon it in Christian character, common sense demands that one understand oneself, one's strength and weakness, one's past and future; and as well the bearing of circumstance and feeling, of attitude and view upon the Christian purpose that inspires life.

Self-knowledge is necessary in all spiritual endeavor. That knowledge involves some understanding of the ways of selfishness and of the fallacies that interfere constantly with effort to obey a spiritual ideal. The vague perception of that ideal together with unsystematic efforts to obey it in a vague way, and neglect of serious self-examination make spiritual progress improbable and expose one to the danger of a shallow self-complacency. Cardinal Mercier speaks somewhere of the embarrassments which result from faulty personal methods in spiritual life. It would be well for us to sit in judgment from time to time on the methods that we follow. Failure to do this will baffle us in spite of real or imaginary good will in respect of our spiritual welfare.

We are familiar with the old philosophical principle, "Quidquid recipitur, per modum recipientis recipitur". When the truths of spiritual life are given to us, the measure in which we receive and obey them is determined largely by the way in which we unconsciously act. If we have the habit of deceiving ourselves, self-deception interferes with the action of spiritual truth and grace. The rainfall as it reaches the earth is governed by the nature of the soil and the slant of the surface. A steep, hard surface causes a quick run-off and permits but little absorption. A less steep and softer earth insures a larger degree of absorption with corresponding benefit to vegetation. In much the same way habits of mind, traits of temperament, settled attitudes constitute the surface upon which the truths of spiritual life fall. When we fail to recognize the effects of these personal traits upon our assimilation of spiritual truth we make a serious mistake in method. Common sense requires that we study ourselves impartially, that we understand our natural traits and that we deal with these with firm hand as an elementary condition to progress in spiritual life.

Some one has well said, "Men are apt to suffer their minds to be misled by fallacies which gratify their passions. Many persons have obscured and confounded the nature of things by their wretched sophistry; though an act be never so sinful they will strip it of its guilt." So long as this occurs and no attention is paid to the process, the high purposes of spiritual endeavor will hardly be realized in one's soul. It may be well then to direct attention again toward personal fallacies that are found widely among us. Without attending too strictly to the logical meaning of the term, we may take it to indicate certain attitudes of mind that interfere seriously with the correct insight and stable self-discipline necessary in the process of receiving and obeying spiritual truth. Nothing new can be said about these. There is no demand of common sense, nor is there any wholesome method in spiritual life that has not been discussed with insight and power countless times in our literature. Nevertheless we must go back again and again to obvious truths and to advice which many look upon as commonplace. So long as we bring personal fallacies to our spiritual tasks it will be necessary to continue to hold them before us in the hope of mastering them in some degree.

I.

The first trait now held in mind is found in the fallacy of isolating actions, of dealing with them merely as actions, and not as significant indications of temperament. In medicine diagnosis goes behind symptoms in seeking the physical condition which produced them. Treatment pays relatively little attention to symptom and serious attention to condition. A cure is effected not when a symptom is conquered but when the condition is corrected. An analogy holds for the spiritual life. A fault or sin is a symptom of our qualities. One who pays attention only to action and repents of it without further concern leaves one's qualities undisturbed and promises a repetition of the fault when occasion invites it.

When this occurs we meet the fallacy of isolating actions out of their place in character. We deal with them as having neither antecedents nor consequences. The true meaning of an action is understood only when we look into its beginnings, its circumstances and its real character as a revelation of our

deeper self. The significance of any action apart from the guilt of sin is in the qualities that it expresses. The habit of ignoring these qualities and of dealing with the action superficially will account for the baffling of many graces given to the priest. Enlightened practice in spiritual life tells us all of this in many ways. Confession includes actions that are faults or sins and invite true repentance. The particular examination of conscience, so cherished in our traditions, directs attention toward qualities that interfere with spiritual progress. Spiritual direction always moves beyond action to its meaning, that is to qualities that lead to it. The drift of clerical retreats presses attention toward the deeper meaning of actions and the knowledge of personal qualities which underlie fault or sin. Resolutions are of little avail unless they include honest attention to qualities of temperament as well as to control of actions.

All details have universal meaning. Actions are details in one's life. If a straw will tell the direction of a wind, an action will tell the direction of a life. The thoughtful priest, in dealing with his faults, will never isolate them out of their relation to his life as a whole. He will see them as symptoms of qualities and he will bring the correction of these qualities within the range of his daily solicitude. So long as the fallacy of isolating actions is permitted to operate undisturbed, only shallow self-knowledge will be found. Only uncertain spiritual effort will appear. The growth in holiness that includes the transformation of personal qualities will be halted. Good method requires, therefore, not alone that motives be good, but also that one be on guard against this fallacy in everyday life and set both intelligence and will no less than prayer at the task of conquering it.

In a general way, the priest who deals with the faults and sins of his people acts upon these truths constantly. If, for instance, he chides a young man in his congregation for theft or any other sin, his mind follows two lines of observation. He interprets to the sinner the significance of his action in view of his Christian training, family standing, personal intelligence, and graces. He then forecasts the consequences that await the sinner unless he not only repent of his sin but also correct the qualities that led to it. In other words, the

pastor gives a wide interpretation to the action of the sinner and makes appeal for watchfulness which will conquer the qualities that lead toward sin. The fallacy of isolating actions is overturned completely by a wise priest in such a case and a correct organic view of the action in its place in life is brought to expression. Should not the priest employ the same method in his own personal life? Should he not look into the qualities out of which fault or sin emerges, aim to correct them and to cultivate the qualities of character that will prevent their recurrence? The general truth against which this fallacy operates is impressively set forth in the following. A man "acts, he suffers, not in the void, not—in his consciousness at least—at the tug and pull of blind instincts, but upon some spiritual and moral terms. He calls things evil and good and right and wrong and suffers remorse and shame. He always acts and suffers upon definite assumptions, through and by a definite view of the world. Search deep enough any act or pang and you come upon the sufferer's philosophy of life—his notions of good and evil, of the world and God. An old woman sits in a room sewing her shroud. A bruised, sore woman creeps back into a house because the man who owns it is called her husband. A lad in the streets hears a drum and sees a flag and races toward death and doom. These actions require assumptions into which are packed whole histories, mythologies, philosophies. And the idea of an action is of far more startling import, of far more searing terror, than the individual action itself, and plays in which the ideas of actions are brought before the bar of dramatic justice make the mere rattle of action seem as tame and senseless as the movements of little animals."[1]

II.

A second fallacy is found in the habit of isolating one's social experiences out of the sum total of all corresponding social experience. Just as an action should be seen in its place as a whole, a person should look upon himself as a member of society in fixed relations with others, as one detail in social life. All social relations are aspects of personal life and personal life is an aspect of social life. There is a brotherhood of

[1] Literary Review, *N. Y. Evening Post*, 21 January, 1922.

evil due to Adam, as well as a brotherhood in resurrection derived from Redemption through Christ. Sin in one person is an organic part of all sin which defeats the benevolence of God. Virtue in one person is part of all virtue that is the fruit of the Redemption. Sufficient recoil against sin in personal life depends upon some degree of the vision of sin as a whole. If a priest were to isolate sin in himself out of the sum total of evil, he would fail of a quality of insight that would otherwise give him the strength of a giant and the aspirations of a saint in resisting sin. The priest who isolates has own virtue as an aspect of personal life and fails to associate it actively with all supernatural virtue whatsoever, will miss much of the inspiration that comes from sweet association with all of the noble souls that honor God and indicate the triumph of His grace.

There is a tendency in all of us to organize life around ourselves, to shrink from the discipline of wide understanding and to recoil from the effort necessary to gain a balanced view of life as a whole and of our place in it. Henry George was credited during his lifetime with a story which expresses this truth with striking effect. He told of a little girl who was studying Physical Geography in her school. She was amazed to discover that her backyard at home was a part of the earth that she was studying in her text book. Every priest is forbidden to shrink his views of sin and virtue upon himself alone. He should be concerned about the interests of Christ in the race. He should behold the work of redemption as involving humanity, as directed toward the conquest of all sin and the restoration of all life to its intended supernatural harmony with the will of God. A mind which is accustomed to extend its vision and sympathy to this wider view will behold all sin in its collective horror and all virtue in its collective transcendent beauty. Much of the priest's recoil against personal sin will be due to his vision of all sin. Many of his wearying struggles to lift behavior to the high plane of spiritual integrity will find promise of victory when he brings the superb strength of the larger vision of all virtue to his struggle.

This is true in the life of any Christian. It is notably true in the life of a priest. A priest is one detail in the priesthood. He should look upon himself through his vision of the priest-

hood as a whole. He should look upon sin in himself not merely as personal sin but as an indignity placed upon the blessed priesthood of which he is a part. He should look upon his own virtue not merely as personal loyalty to Christ but also as belonging to the loyalty of the priesthood as a whole to Christ.

It is probable as well as possible that the thoughtless priest will miss this wider view of sin and of virtue. He will isolate his own personal experience out of the sum total of corresponding human experience and miss the larger view of sin and of virtue which is rooted in the ultimate unity of all sin in Adam and of all redemption in Jesus Christ.[2]

III

The fallacy of self-exception appears in the course of our thought as more or less related to the foregoing. It has its basis in a curious mixture of inadvertence and superstition. Inadvertence appears when we look outward thoughtlessly toward the laws of spiritual life without taking account of the unconscious favoritism with which we treat ourselves. The well-known principle, "Nemo judex in causa sua", takes account of this tendency in a most definite way. We are inclined to make excuses for ourselves, to make ourselves appear to advantage, to make concessions which excuse effort and to exercise a discriminating blindness that will always operate in the direction of our comfort. This is natural, fundamental and dangerous. Superstition appears in the fallacy of self-exception as a form of belief in our luck. It is extremely difficult, if we except the small number of melancholy pessimists, to believe that great disaster can come to us, although we readily understand how it might strike others. An impersonal view of the operation of the laws of life, which respect no person and show no favoritism, is gained with extreme difficulty and yet it is necessary to all practical wisdom. On the other hand it is easy to believe in one's good fortune and expect it, to assume that good fortune may be assured to ourselves if not to others, with relative ease. Others might be killed or die

[2] See ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, July, 1927, "The Work and the Vision of the Priest". The thought will be developed from another standpoint in a future article.

suddenly. Such a fate could hardly be reserved for me. "Others might die without making a will, but I shall have plenty of time to make mine." Hell may be the penalty of grievous unrepented sin, but one hardly associates the thought of hell with oneself. The justice of God may await others, but His mercy is particularly favorable to ourselves. Others might die in the state of sin, but time for repentance would surely be given to me.

Similar illustrations of the fallacy of self-exception are found everywhere. The priest who warns parents about the danger of wrongdoing in their children meets this frame of mind frequently. They will feel and say, "Those tragedies might occur to others but God would not let them happen to our children". A pastor once warned a mother who permitted her son aged nine to play constantly upon the street where there was a double car-track with much rapidly moving traffic. She replied, "Accidents might happen to other children but the Sacred Heart would not permit my boy to be injured or killed". Police officers say that criminals of every kind are to a marked degree victims of this fallacy. A burglar would hardly enter a house without first convincing himself that he would escape detection, although others might be easily caught. He is the victim of belief in his luck and shrewdness. A criminal at this moment under sentence of death has stated that the crime was made possible because of failure to take in a personal way the social and spiritual warnings against crime that had often been heard.

Most of the delays, evasions, excuses, presumptions, blindness and lack of foresight that are found in the moral and spiritual history of the world have been made possible in large measure because of the unconscious habit of surrender to the fallacy of self-exception. Only careful self-examination and a deliberate attempt to gain insight into the general laws of spiritual life and the lessons of human experience will free even a priest from the subtleties of this fallacy. None of our notions or unconscious assumptions have any validity against the operation of laws of nature. One may not stand as a traffic officer might and raise a hand to divert from oneself the tragedies that approach one simply because one believes in his good fortune and finds it difficult to associate the penalties of

his mistakes with himself. The thought is expressed in a half-truth found in an old essay which, in spite of the error that it contains, has a lesson for us: "The essence of immorality consists in making exceptions in favor of one's self." [3]

IV.

We meet also certain fallacies of valuation. They are in fact aspects of the fallacy of self-exception, but it may be worth while to single them out for particular attention. We underrate evil in ourselves and exaggerate it in others. We overrate virtue in ourselves and underrate it in others. When we behold evil in others our exaggeration of it permits us to shine by contrast. When we observe nobility in others it is an indictment of ourselves unless we can reduce its proportions in a way that permits us to be at our ease in respect of it. If one is lazy or unspiritual, the only way to be comfortable in the presence of noble action is to underrate it. We can easily denounce cruelty or injustice or the giving of needless pain as we behold these done by others, but not one of these faults seems equally unworthy when we ourselves are guilty of it. A pastor gives edifying attention to the sick in his parish. If he is described to a victim of the fallacy of valuation, the latter may remark, "Why should he not be devoted to the sick? That is his duty." But if the same victim of this fallacy who lacks equal zeal is criticized, may we not imagine him answering, "Oh! the sick are too exacting." If he takes this attitude he is neither edified by the good example of the former nor disturbed by his own neglect. All of this occurs if the illustration holds, because of the fallacy of valuation in respect of oneself and of others.

[3] The essence of immorality consists in violation of a known law of God. The fallacy of self-exception relates to a method that may occur in wrongdoing or in one's failure to conform life to a divine pattern. A curious illustration of our thought is found in the remark of a priest who had been in several accidents. He said that in every case his mind instantly formed the question, "Am I myself? I cannot be, for such an accident could not happen to me." Newman remarks in the *Grammar of Assent* (page 347): "What I have to ascertain is the laws under which I live. My first elementary lesson of duty is that of resignation to the laws of my nature, whatever they are; my first disobedience is to be impatient at what I am and to indulge an ambitious aspiration after what I cannot be, to cherish a distrust of my powers and to desire to change laws which are identical with myself."

In view of our limitations, particularly of our inability to look into any human heart, we may not expect at any time to have adequate knowledge of merit in others or even in ourselves. But if fallacies of valuation are found naturally in us in a way something like the one indicated, effort should be made to master them, to recognize and profit by all virtue in others and to be willing to diminish in some measure, severity of judgment concerning their faults. In this way we fill the world with goodness. We cultivate the habit of edification and our lives are enriched. On the other hand willingness to see our own faults in their undiminished ugliness, and a modest attitude toward our own virtue will be more nearly in keeping with the truth that makes us free. Such a victory requires thoughtful care, but it is well worth that cost. The duties of humility and of charity as we know them in the Christian life conquer all fallacies of valuation when we permit them to do so.[4]

V.

There are fallacies resulting from the division of life which have far-reaching consequences upon our spiritual progress. We meet them at the outset in our habit of dividing past from present and present from future in personal life and also in dividing the interests of life in a way to interfere with the jurisdiction of the soul in each detail of action.

Every life is one unbroken continuity. The past is always with us. The future is to a large extent determined to-day. "All past is prophecy." The impressions and experiences of childhood remain with us in our adult years actually determining much that we now are. While we retain power of will and we count always upon the grace of God, we must recognize the solidarity of life and the unity of experience as these are with us under the operation of the very laws of our nature. Past sins may be sources of weakness through experience, memory, awakened impulse, and lack of deeper understanding. They will be, however, occasions of deeper love of God and glorious strength in His service when we realize their implications and stand against them under the guidance of our alarmed

[4] See *The Catholic World*, February, 1927, "In the Household of the Virtues", where this thought is discussed in another relation.

love of Him. There have been saints and many not recorded as saints who found new vision of God and new glory of spiritual consecration when they looked toward Heaven through tears of repentance.

If we divide past from present and consider that the former has no relation to the latter, we shall miss much of the self-knowledge that conditions our wisdom and we shall risk the commission of many a fault against which proper understanding of the past might have given us protection. What is said is as true of our virtues as it is of our faults. The virtue of our earlier years is the basis of our wisdom, strength and aspiration to-day. But for the moment, only our faults are held in mind. The prayer in the Canon of the Mass, "Libera nos, Domine, ab omnibus malis praeterritis, praesentibus et futuris," shows us how clearly the Church perceives these truths and brings them within the range of our daily supernatural concern. The thought is expressed with force and beauty in the words of Ruskin: "As I myself look at it there is no fault or folly of my life—and both have been many and great—that does not rise up against me and take away my joy and shorten my possession of sight, of understanding. And every past effort of my life, every gleam of righteousness or good in it is with me now, to help me in my grasp of this art and its vision. So far as I can rejoice in or interpret either, my power is owing to what there is of right in me. I dare to say it, that, because through my life I have desired good and not evil; because I have been kind to many; have wished to be kind to all; have wilfully injured none and because I have loved much and not selfishly; —therefore, the morning light is yet visible to me on those hills and you who read may trust my thought and word in such work as I have to do for you and you will be glad afterwards that you have trusted them."[5]

Of course, all morbid self-questioning is forbidden. All anxious doubt concerning the forgiveness of sin and the abiding mercy of our Lord is unwholesome in the highest degree. But practical wisdom in the spiritual life requires that none of the lessons of the past be lost and that we guard ourselves against its curt dismissal without a thought. Absolution wipes

[5] *Athena in the Heart.* Chapter III of *The Queen of the Air.* One will find here a striking explanation of this truth in all social life.

out the guilt of sin. Indulgences set aside the temporal punishment due to sin. But beyond these remain the laws of our nature which hold life in one unbroken unity and make the past a factor in the present.

Another fallacy of the division of life occurs when we permit any activity or any interest in life whatsoever to lose spiritual quality. God is our God always, *Semper et pro semper.* The fact of living makes man spiritual and makes all life spiritual. Religion is not part of life. It is the law of all life. Spiritual truth is not reserved to devotions. It extends its jurisdiction to the most remote fastnesses of the human heart wherever conscious action is found. The clerk who sells a hat performs an action that has spiritual quality. The banker who makes a loan may not segregate that action from his spiritual life. The chairman of the board of directors of an industrial corporation brings every truth of the spiritual world with him into every detail of his thinking and leadership. The priest who builds a school or objects to the division of his parish, deals with an unpleasant neighboring pastor or disagrees with his bishop, may not separate one of these activities from its measured place in his spiritual history. If a priest permits a single one of his ordinary relations to escape the jurisdiction and axioms of spiritual life, he will to that extent make a desert in his soul.

Now the world has divided life into countless departments that seem to be unrelated to one another. Business, recreation, the professions, tend to become more or less independent units. Many are inclined to consider religion one department of life held to a somewhat limited jurisdiction. As a result, life has taken on a significant unspiritual quality that makes for much confusion of soul and moral disaster. If we keep in mind our natural tendencies in personal life to shrink the jurisdiction of spiritual truth, to do and plan many things without first submitting them to the spiritual law for approval, we may be prepared to see the effect of this larger division of life upon our character. Hence it becomes possible for us to do many things, to take many attitudes and to cultivate many interests that escape in varying degree the discipline of spiritual truth. Every Christian and certainly every priest is called upon to perceive and to respect the full spiritual quality of every action.

Failure to do this permits the fallacy of the division of life to cause grave spiritual harm.

VI.

However we describe and name the traits that have been mentioned, it is fair to assume that since they appear among human beings generally they will be found in some measure among priests. Good methods in spiritual life call for attention to them and invite systematic effort to overcome them. Whatever the good will that a priest brings to the work of his personal sanctification, lack of intelligent attention to these qualities will lead to faulty methods. And faulty methods in spiritual life do much to defeat even the noblest aspirations. Superficial views of our actions with no attention to qualities that underlie them; narrow views of personal sin and virtue which shut out the wider significance of both; spiritual favoritism which excuses us from brave self-discipline and sustained effort after holiness; mistaken valuations of sin and of goodness in comparing ourselves with others; breaking the unity of personal and of social life into unrelated fragments, are habits of mind toward which we naturally drift. Efforts toward personal sanctification which leave these traits out of the account are made futile in as far as the fallacies that rest on them are undisturbed. The priest who sets before himself a great spiritual ideal and shapes his motives to it should not fail to adapt his methods in spiritual life to these human traits in as far as they are to be found in him. When a great ideal and flawless good will are accompanied by right methods, the blessing of God will lead us gently toward the sheltered ways of the peace of Christ.

W. J. K.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

A MEDICO-MORAL PROBLEM—ECTOPIC GESTATION.[1]

I. The Facts.

The ethical problems that confront both the surgeon and the moralist give rise to great anxiety. On the one hand, there is often a life to be saved, usually that of the mother; on the other, there is a life to be protected, usually that of the fetus. Surgical procedure is, at times, severely criticized by the moralist. Well-established moral principles are apt to be repudiated by the surgeon who allows himself to be influenced by the teaching of his text books and by the normal and accepted procedure. But, we believe that for the most part, surgical practice has come more into line, of recent years, with the conclusions of Christian ethics. There is not now, as there used to be, a too facile readiness to perform operations that destroy a nascent life, for surgical science has discovered methods of saving life, where heretofore both the life of the mother and of the fetus would have been lost, or that of the fetus sacrificed. Thus, at the annual meeting (1926) of the British Medical Association, England, in the Section of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, T. W. Eden, M. D., a great authority on his subject, laid down certain indications for the surgical termination of pregnancy, or what is euphemistically called, therapeutic abortion. Most of the surgeons who took part in the discussion accepted his conclusions, but it was gratifying to the Catholic moralist to find that H. Harvey Evers, M.D., F.R.C.S., was requested by Professor Ranken Lyle to submit to the meeting three good reasons why the induction of abortion should now practically *never be considered,* viz:—1. an enormous importance is attached to the value of intrauterine

[1] This subject was treated extensively in the Review by surgeons and theologians in 1894. Since then there has been advance in our medical and surgical treatment of the problem.—Editor's Note.

life at the present time; 2. great improvements in medicinal treatment of most complications have taken place in recent times; 3. the dangers originally urged against pregnancy under certain conditions *were mostly of a speculative nature and mostly groundless.*

The subject of ectopic gestation is one of the few remaining problems in which, as it appears to the present writer, opinion is not yet settled amongst moralists. There is still a wide divergence of opinion on the part of both moralists and surgeons, more so, perhaps, on the part of moralists, as to the right ethical treatment of such cases. It is certainly not the intention of the present writer to teach surgeons what they ought to do, nor to express any disagreement with the many competent moralists, who rightly condemn all operations on the inviable, ectopic fetus. The sole purpose of this treatment of a very serious problem is, it is hoped, to contribute a little to the elucidation of the case, and to invite criticism from the many moralists and surgeons who are perfectly aware of the difficulties of the matter. It might be thought that such a problem had better be left alone, for it may be imprudent to bring the matter under discussion, and the *bona fides* of many a Catholic surgeon may be disturbed. We fear no such result. It is certainly all to the good that moral principles on abortion, craniotomy, conception-control should be frankly stated, for if the moral law is at stake, no good can come, in the long run, to any profession or to any people by its violation. Furthermore, it is an undoubted fact that where true moral principles are correctly applied, it is found that human liberty is not restricted to the extent that was supposed, since true moral standards are not unreasonable; they commend themselves; they put a check on license only and benefit both the individual and society.

It will be necessary to state briefly some physiological facts in order to bring the problem concerning ectopic gestation into the clearest possible relief.

Ectopic gestation means pregnancy of a fetus or embryo outside the *uterus*. Fetus is a term employed when speaking of the human being as it is from the end of the fourth week to birth. Embryo is the name given to the undifferentiated product of conception from the second to the fourth week after

fertilization. Ovum is the term used for the fertilized female ovule up to the second week of gestation.

It is generally thought that the female ovule is fertilized by the male spermatozoon in the fallopian tube. The end of this tube furthest from the uterus is fringed and shaped like a funnel, called the *ampulla.* One of the fringed ends, the *fimbria ovarica,* is longer than the others and forms a shallow gutter which extends to the ovary. The ovary supplies the ovules, which burst from the surface of the ovary. Normally, the ovule traveling down the fallopian tube toward the uterus, either by the peristaltic action of the tube or by the action of the cilia, small hair-like processes within the tube, meets a spermatozoon, the head of which pierces the ovule and sets up fertilization by the multiplying of living cells. Each element, male and female, has its share in the production of new cells. Whether fertilization takes place in the tube, or on the surface of the ovary, or in the end of the ampulla, or in the uterus itself, is immaterial to our present purpose.

The fertilized ovum becomes imbedded in the membrane of the uterus, which then extends and enfolds the ovum; hence the name, *decidua reflexa.* As the ovum develops, it is contained in a fluid, *liquor amnii,* which itself is enveloped by a membrane, the *amnion,* entirely fetal, and covering the dorsal surface and sides of the embryo. There is another membrane which enfolds the amnion, called the chorion, and between the two membranes a fluid, improperly called the waters. The chorion comes into contact with the walls of the uterus, and it is from the chorion and its villi that the fetal part of the placenta is developed. The maternal portion of the placenta is formed from the *decidua* and is external to the placenta derived from the fetus. The placenta thus consists of three layers: the innermost, entirely fetal; the outermost, entirely maternal; an intermediate layer comprising a complex arrangement of fetal villi and maternal sinuses. In normal cases, the fertilized product goes to term and a child is born. Accidentally, however, the fecundated ovum may remain in the tube and develop there. It is liable to become a mole, containing an embryo and its membranes. There is danger then of complete rupture of the tube, or of tubal abortion; in the latter case the fetus slips down the tube away from the uterus into

the peritoneal cavity. There is also the danger of a leakage of blood from the burst tube, and the formation of blood clot in the pelvic cavity.

The bursting of the tube is ordinarily very serious for the mother, and it is presumed by the surgeon to be a fatal situation unless an immediate operation is performed in order to save the life of the mother. It is a matter for the surgeon to diagnose tubal pregnancy and tubal rupture. Diagnosis of the former is said to be exceedingly difficult; in fact, in the earliest stages, impossible, though it may be suspected to exist, and on opening the abdomen the suspicion may be confirmed. The modern practice appears to be to remove the sac and fetus, when an ectopic has been discovered, whether the tube has burst or not, and not to exercise expectant treatment. Any woman, it is stated, while bearing an ectopic fetus is in constant danger of death, but the danger is not, of course, always so imminent as to demand immediate operation. Nevertheless, a case is quoted in which a fatal haemorrhage occurred in two days from rupture when the fetus was only as large as a Lima bean. Another case is quoted where three of the best obstetricians of Philadelphia met in consultation daily for sixteen days, expectantly waiting developments, but the woman died from haemorrhage in thirty minutes, before any of these physicians could be called to her aid. It is asserted that 78 per cent of all ectopic gestations result in tubal abortion and 22 per cent in rupture. The fetus usually dies in each contingency; it rarely continues to live; it may, however, develop in the abdominal cavity, that is, outside the uterus, and go to full term. It may die though viable, and after a mock labor will shrivel up and is, by modern practice, allowed to do so, in consequence of the very serious danger of death to the mother in the endeavor, by operation, to remove the placenta which adheres to adjacent organs. Haines found fifty operations for ectopic gestation done after the seventh month of pregnancy with ten maternal deaths. In 1903 Sittner compiled one hundred and fifty-two cases of viable ectopic fetuses. Since then more have been reported.

From this account it will readily be seen that ectopic gestation is indefinitely dangerous to the mother, and in the laudable endeavor to save the mother, the surgeon is confronted with

very serious ethical difficulties as to the treatment of a living inviable fetus, that is, if he discover the presence of one. For the elucidation, from the Catholic point of view, of these and such cases, we must lay it down from the outset, as a fact which cannot be denied, that a living embryo or a fetus, no matter how young, is a human being, and as such has an organism and a soul, and is a person in the fullest meaning of the term. We do not accept the legal fiction that an *infans in utero* is not a person until birth. Jurisprudence may formulate its own definitions, but it cannot get away from facts. We readily admit that the fetus may not be a legal person for most things, but we insist that as it is a human being, it has its own right to life, sustenance and care. If this statement is not admitted, all subsequent argument in this treatment of the subject may be dismissed as irrelevant, and the reader need proceed no farther.

II. Surgical Opinion and Procedure.

Since the treatment of ectopic pregnancy is a matter for the surgeon in the first instance, it will be of great moment to record surgical opinion on the dangers of ectopics, and on the procedure recommended. The opinions of a large number of eminent surgeons in the United States of America were obtained. It was thought advisable by the writer to solicit these opinions, first, because the population of the United States being so great, many cases of ectopics naturally arise; secondly, the skill of these surgeons is of the first rank; thirdly, as there is a large Catholic population in the United States, Catholic opinion makes itself felt in surgical procedure. The opinions are here set forth without any prejudice to the ethical questions that may arise. We do not ask surgeons to pronounce judgment on ethical issues. All that we ask them to do is to pronounce on the risks that attend ectopic pregnancies.

The following opinions were gathered by the Rev. H. S. Spalding, S.J., and communicated to the writer. Father Spalding was, for four years, Dean of the Medical Department of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; for seven years Dean of the Medical Department of Loyola University, Chicago; during the period he gave weekly lectures to the senior medical students on ethics, and for years addressed lectures to nurses and hospital Sisters on the ethical matters

pertinent to their profession. He wrote several books and articles on these subjects. It will be readily admitted, therefore, that Father Spalding was not likely to confuse the issue and that if he stated, as he did state, that the subject of ectopic pregnancies is a very serious problem for the Catholic surgeon and nurse, and that no trouble should be spared to understand where precisely ethical considerations come into contact with surgical procedure, his statement must be attended to by Catholic moralists, and a definite answer, prudently and wisely formulated, must be given both to the Catholic surgeon and the nurse for their guidance when confronted with a case of ectopic gestation.

In collecting the opinions, prominent surgeons were interviewed, a questionnaire was submitted, letters were sent to Catholic hospitals, with a request that replies be sent by the most capable and most conscientious surgeons on the several hospital staffs. Less than half the replies came from Catholic surgeons.

The question stated was as follows:

1. Catholic ethics permit the removal of a uterus, even during pregnancy, when there is a tumor threatening the life of the mother.
2. In tubal pregnancy, can it be said that there is a pathological condition which threatens the life of the mother, as the uterine tumor does?

Many of the replies went into a detailed description of tubal pregnancy, its causes, dangers, etc. Forty-one replies were in the affirmative, namely, that tubal pregnancy is a pathological condition; in other words, is a disease. Five of the answers were vague but seemed to favor the affirmative. Two denied the comparison with tumor of the uterus. One denied that there was a pathological condition in tubal pregnancy.

By far the greater number, Catholic and non-Catholic, expressed their firm conviction that tubal pregnancy is not only a pathological condition but is far more dangerous than cancer of the uterus.

1. "I would state absolutely that there is a pathological condition present in tubal pregnancy, which threatens the life of the mother exactly as in the case of tumor of the uterus."—J. F. GOLDEN, M.D.

2. "Tubal pregnancy is a pathological condition which always threatens the life of the mother, not as an uterine tumor would, but *per se*."—C. A. COBB, M.D.
3. "I do not consider tumor (of the uterus) as a positive indication for termination of labor, but I do (consider) a tubal pregnancy."—H. H. OZELIM, M.D.
4. "The answer to this question must be in the affirmative. I do not believe there could possibly be any professional controversy over this question."—J. W. NIXON, M.D.

5-6-7. "In our opinion, the proposition contained in Question No. 2 justifies an operation even more clearly than the condition as outlined in Statement No. 1, because not infrequently, a pregnant woman may have a tumor of the uterus and be delivered safely in a normal manner, or finally by Caesarean Section; whereas extra-uterine pregnancy is practically always fatal to the child and frequently to the mother. In short, our answer is, yes."—W. M. WOLF, M.D., F. P. HERFF, M.D., C. W. TAYLOR, M.D.

8. "In answer to No. 2, Yes."—GEO. LEACHBURY, M.D.
9. "Yes. In the majority of cases an extra-uterine pregnancy is even more threatening to the life of the mother than is a pregnancy in a uterus which is the seat of a tumor."—M. J. HENRY, M.D.
10. "Yes. While there have been instances of extra-uterine pregnancies going to full term with delivery of a living child by Caesarean Section, there are thousands upon thousands of instances where disease and even death have resulted from fertilization of the ovum outside the uterine cavity. In so far as the tube is not designed to receive and permit the development of the fertilized ovum, the occurrence of fertilization with arrest of the ovum at this point is, in my mind, surely pathological, and offers a definite menace to the health and even the life of the mother."—IRVIN ABELL, M.D.
11. "At no time, during the progress of pregnancy, wherein there is a tumor of the womb, is there any danger, in proportion to the dangers of a tubal pregnancy, as the tumor of the womb in itself does not cause sudden haemorrhage, but may cause a miscarriage or premature birth, whereas a tubal pregnancy causes a sudden haemorrhage, which endangers life immediately, and in which every minute is of vital interest to the patient, and this haemorrhage in itself causes death if not attended to. Further, in a tubal pregnancy, which is a pathological condition, any alteration of function causes pathology, and at no time, have I ever seen, and on every few occasions

do the records show that a tubal pregnancy has ever gone to term. History does state that such a thing has happened, but the percentage is so minute, that we are not justified in allowing a pathological condition to attempt arresting itself without our assistance."—CARL B. YOUNG, M.D.

12. "Tubal pregnancy is abnormally located as the result of disease or some accident of nature, and is a menace to the life of the mother from its inception and is, therefore, in my opinion, a pathological process and threatens the life of the mother in a higher percentage of cases than does any uterine tumor of which I have any knowledge, except malignant tumors."—D. F. BARNES, M.D.
13. "There is a pathology existing which often kills unless interfered with."—DR. ——— (Houston, Texas).
14. "In my own experience, and I am sure in the literature, tubal pregnancy presents a more dangerous prognosis than a pregnant uterus which is also the site of a tumor. The possibility of development of the embryo in a tubular pregnancy is almost nil if not entirely so. My view of tubular pregnancy is that it is a distinct pathological entity, resulting from an abnormal implantation and development in a structure which is not suitable for its normal growth and retention. In other words, the tubular pregnancy will abort with most grave and serious haemorrhage."—A. WATKINS, M.D.
15. "Tubal pregnancy is a physiologically malignant tumor in that it is so located that after a given growth-period rupture of an organ is produced and may occur in such manner as to cause a solution in continuity of a blood vessel that will bleed the host to death. All cancers do not produce the death of the host. Some heal spontaneously without treatment.

    "Personally, I cannot see any difference from an ethical viewpoint in the two conditions, except that it takes cancer longer to kill the host than it does a tubal pregnancy. The secondary cause of death in each instance is very often the same, namely haemorrhage."—D. C. GANN, M.D.
16. "Ectopic pregnancy is always a serious pathological, surgical condition. The mortality of this pathological condition, when not interferred with, is 69%, and on account of the imminent danger to the life of the mother, the extra-uterine pregnancy in the early months must be looked upon much as a malignant growth, and it is only from the seventh month of the pregnancy, when the child is viable, that it has any claim to consideration."—N. F. WENY, M.D.

17. "As there is as yet no expectant treatment for a growing or ruptured tubular pregnancy, I regard it as a pathological condition endangering the life of the mother and future health should she recover. It is my humble opinion that on account of the high mortality, the removal of a pathological pregnant tube is as justifiable as the removal of a pathological pregnant uterus. They should be placed in the same category in the Catholic Ethics."—J. M. R. DIBRELL, M.D.
18. "In tubal pregnancy the mother's life is in a great deal more danger than in uterine tumor. The pregnancy practically never goes to the viable time of the child. The mother is in constant danger from both haemorrhage and sepsis. She is an invalid as long as she carries the fetus."—JOHN R. BEIRL, M.D.
19. "I know of only one pathological condition of the pelvis that is more serious to the life of a woman than is tubal pregnancy. The chances for saving the life of the fetus are practically zero."—D. S. WIER, M.D.
20. "Tubal pregnancy is more menacing to the life of the mother than the various pelvic tumors in the presence of pregnancy. Some of the best obstetric authorities refer to the tubal pregnancy as 'an explosive body' (Werth) that must be removed at once; there is no expectant treatment (De Lee)."—JOSEPH R. CONDON, M.D.
21. "In tubal pregnancy, there is an acute pathological condition threatening the mother's life."—D. E. KELLEY, M.D.
22. "Tubal pregnancy is a definite patholgical condition which greatly endangers the life of the patient."—DANIEL FR. CROWLEY, M.D.
23. "In tubal pregnancy there is certainly a pathological condition which threatens the life of the mother as the uterine tumor does."—HENRY L. LEWIS, M.D.
24. "Ectopic Gestation is pathologic . . . I would call it a physiological process pathologically located."—EUGENE P. HAMILTON, M.D.
25. "An extra-uterine pregnancy should be considered in the same category with a tumor of the uterus endangering the patient's life."—FRANKLIN S. NEWELL, M.D.
26. "In tubal pregnancy there is a definite pathological condition which threatens the life of the mother quite as certainly as does the average uterine tumor."—C. JEFF MILLER, M.D.
27. "Tubal pregnancy is preëminently a condition which threatens the life of the mother . . . The ovum in the tube behaves almost like a malignant growth."—J. WHITRIDGE WILLIAMS, M.D.

28. "In tubal pregnancy there is a pathological condition which threatens the life of the mother more acutely and more positively than in the majority of uterine tumors. I believe no obstetric authority will dissent from this view."—JOSEPH B. DE LEE, M.D.

The reader will not think it necessary that the adverse opinions, which are very few, should be recorded here. Amongst a large number of considered opinions one surgeon maintained that tubal pregnancy was not a pathological condition. As he enjoys no greater eminence than the rest, and as he gave no reason for his opinion, it appears to be reasonable to suppose either that he was mistaken or that he was using technical terms in a narrow sense.

III. THE OPINIONS OF MODERN THEOLOGIANS.

In this section, it is the writer's intention to quote most of the modern theologians who have dealt with the problem of ectopics, and to subject their statements to dispassionate criticism. The purpose of this chapter is, not to defend any preconceived solution of the problem, but merely to find out and to set forth the trend of modern theological opinion. When that has been done, it will be possible to form an opinion on the ethical rightfulness or otherwise of the excision of that part of the fallopian tube, which contains a living inviable fetus, for that and that alone is the problem.

The reader, however, must bear in mind two replies of the Holy Office, which have guided all subsequent theologians in the handling of the problem of ectopics.

In March, 1900, the query was sent to the Holy Office:

Is it ever permissible to extract from the maternal organs ectopic fetuses, not yet viable, before the sixth completed month after conception?

In 1902, the reply was given:

No, in accordance with the decree of 4 May, 1898, in virtue of which decree serious and opportune precaution must be taken, as far as possible, for the lives of fetus and of mother; in regard, however, to the time (of operation), let the questioner remember that by virtue of the aforesaid decree, no acceleration of delivery is permissible, unless it is done at a time and in a way whereby the lives

of mother and fetus are safeguarded, in accordance with usual contingencies.

Papal approbation was given by Pope Leo XIII to the earlier reply (1898). We must admit that the late reply is merely an application of the former.

1. Father Vermeersch, S.J., now Professor of Moral Theology in the Gregorian University, Rome, thus states his opinion:

> Every extra-uterine pregnancy renders the mother's life less secure. Internal abortion or rupture creates positive danger to her life. Extra-uterine gestation is with great difficulty diagnosed during a certain period. If, however, for purposes of diagnosis (exploration) an incision is made into the mother's abdomen (the surgeon) is practically compelled to excise the sac with its fetus to save the mother's life. But if the ectopic is diagnosed otherwise (than by incision) careful observation diminishes the risk to the mother.

The learned author then proceeds to give his opinion on the ethics of excision of the swollen part of the tube. He rightly distinguishes two cases: one, in which there is uncertainty as to whether the swollen tube contains only a tumor or also a fetus; the other in which it is certain that the tube contains a fetus. He supposes, however, that in the first case the uncertainty cannot be dispelled.

Taking the first case, where there is uncertainty, the author solves the case as follows:—

a. Not a few theologians to-day, after Genicot (Vol. I, 376, in his earlier edition), allow the excision, and that, for two reasons, namely, because the certain right of the mother to life prevails over the probable right of the fetus, and because the mother, being in possession of her rights, is allowed to protect herself against that which might be fatal and is not proved to be a living human being.

b. He then quotes Ferreres (Vol. II, 501, II), who suggests that in the absence of positive arguments that fetal life is present, the operation may be done, but adds, that what is not permissible in certain pregnancy is not permissible in probable pregnancy.

These two authors are thus quoted by Father Vermeersch; and he then states it as his opinion that the principles that one acts on in cases of an undoubted fetus must be practically applied to the case of a probable fetus.

Taking the second case, where *an ectopic fetus is present,* the author deals with it only where the mother's life is in danger. He first quotes other authorities and then states his own opinion.

The authorities cited, with the exception of Antonelli, are in favor of excision of the tube, and do not consider that the two decrees of the Holy Office (1898, 1902) are violated by this operation. As the opinions of these authorities will be examined later, together with the decrees of the Holy Office, it is necessary here to take account only of the opinion of Father Vermeersch. The conclusion which Father Vermeersch adopts unless he can be considered to have approved the opinions quoted—is vague. It is, that the conflict between the medical and the theological schools is regrettable, and that it is to be wished that members of the medical profession should pay more attention to absolute moral principles, and acknowledge how well the Church has served humanity by inculcating and urging the inviolable rights of human personality. If we understand Father Vermeersch aright, we think that he would not allow the operation in question.

2. Genicot-Salsmans states that if there is no hope of saving the fetus, and if the mother is in danger of death, it does not seem unlawful to excise the whole fetal sac as a tumor that is abnormal and deadly for the mother, for in this way, the fetus is not directly killed, but indirectly only. If, however, it is doubtful whether there is a fetus, the same process is permissible.

In a note to the text, Father Salsmans states that the original reason given by Genicot for this procedure—in cases of doubt—was that "the certain right of the mother to her life seems to prevail against the merely probable right of a fetus to its life"; but this reason is not approved by Father Salsmans, who says: "It is not a question of the 'merely probable right of the fetus', but of the 'certain right of a probable fetus'. The distinction appears to the present writer to be merely verbal. However, both Genicot himself and Father Salsmans, his editor, admit the lawfulness of the operation.

3. Arregui states that "in extrauterine gestation it is permissible to excise a tumor or a cyst that is deadly to the mother, even if it contains an inviable fetus. In doubt whether the

swollen tube is a tumor or a pregnancy, it is permissible to excise the tube (if deadly to the mother) provided that the doubt cannot be cleared by the usual indications of a pregnancy."

4. Sabetti-Barrett thus states his view:— "Whilst the surgeon is engaged in a serious operation on a woman, he observes an extrauterine fetus, living but not viable. He may not extract the fetus; such action would kill it." It may be observed at once that all theologians assent to this view, but the question is, may the surgeon *excise the tube,* not, may he *extract the fetus.*

Father Barrett continues: "In doubt as to whether the swollen tube is a pregnancy or a tumor, if the mother is in danger of death, the surgeon may excise the swollen tube, for the mother's right to life is certain. If, however, there is a fetus in the tube, its right to life is equally certain, and therefore excision is not permissible.

5. Aertnys-Damen thinks that the excision of the tumor that contains an inviable fetus is only doubtfully permissible, even when the mother is in the greatest danger of death. But of the two contrary views held regarding the bearing of the decrees of the Holy Office (ann. 1898, 1902) on the matter of ectopics, the author thinks that the said decrees do not forbid the excision of the tumor containing an inviable fetus, if that is the only means of saving the mother's life.

6. Noldin-Schmitt states:

a. If it is certain that the ectopic is a living fetus, excision before the seventh month completed would be direct killing. Expectant treatment must therefore be employed until there is some hope of saving the fetus as well as the mother.[1]

b. If it is doubtful whether a fetus or a tumor is present in the tube, one must wait for more positive signs or till the fetus is viable. But if delay is dangerous, incision is permissible, for in such a case, the fetus (if present) is not directly killed, but the tumor that threatens the life of the mother is excised, although thereby the fetus (if present) will die. This operation is not contrary to the decrees of the Holy Office.

[1] We wonder if the author means that excision of the pregnant tube in the case of imminent danger to the mother's life is direct killing of the fetus. If he does, he ought also to condemn excision of a pregnant uterus when its cancerous condition is an imminent danger to the mother. Yet he admits this in the next section.

7. Prümmer states that if a tumor or a cyst outside the womb has been diagnosed, which, by accident, contains a living fetus, and if such tumor or cyst is the cause of imminent danger to the life of the mother, it may be excised, for this is not direct but indirect abortion, since it is the maternal organ that is directly excised, whereas the fetus (if present and living) perishes indirectly.[2]

8. Ubash accepts the view of Genicot already stated. He would permit the excision of the fetal sac if the situation were imminently dangerous to the mother and excision the only remedy.

9. Ferreres thinks that if the ectopic fetus is doubtfully alive, that is, if the doubt cannot be solved by the ordinary probable signs of pregnancy, the tumor may be excised.

Somewhat similar to the excision of ectopics is a case quoted by Ferreres, the solution of which contains principles that apply to the subject in hand. The following case is presented by him. A surgeon operating on a pregnant woman, gone with child four months and a half, opens the abdomen to excise a tumor without interfering with the pregnancy. Upon incision he finds a smaller tumor at the back of the womb and slightly inflamed. If the smaller tumor is left in situ, birth will be impossible and both Caesarean operation and excision of the womb will be necessary. Then, too, there is a very probable abortion likely to take place soon, considering the condition of the woman and her womb. The fetus will move with difficulty, and the consequences will be grave. If the surgeon leaves the small tumor where it is, he will be held to be the moral cause of the woman's death.

Considering, therefore, the grave possibility, or rather probability of abortion, and *the serious condition to which the woman would be reduced* if the smaller tumor were left, and also how serious the Caesarean operation would be in the very improbable case of the pregnancy going to nine months, the surgeon excised the small tumor and with it both womb and fetus, sacrificing the life of the fetus—already in gravest danger—that he might adopt the safer course for the life of the mother entrusted to his skill.

[2] The author presumably means that the fetus perishes, but that its death was not primarily intended.

After the operation, it was found that the small tumor was gangrened. The fetus was baptized and survived for a short time.

The moral problems were thus stated:

I. On the supposition that both tumor and womb were very seriously diseased, was it morally lawful for the operation to be done?

Reply: The operation was lawful on the supposition that if the tumor had not been excised together with the womb, the mother would have died, even in the absence of pregnancy. The justification is that the danger to the mother's life was caused not by the pregnancy but by the tumor. Every theologian admits that such remedies may be used, if the need of them is very serious and no other remedy is available, even though the fetus will die. It should be added that the fetus was not, in the case, directly assailed—which would be morally wrong—neither intentionally nor by the nature of the operation itself, for the operation would have been necessary—as we suppose—even in the absence of pregnancy. The operation, therefore, did not directly tend to feticide and was not therefore contrary to the letter or spirit of the decrees of the Holy Office.

A parallel case is cited[3] where it is stated that the fetal sac may be punctured to draw off the fluid, in the case of a prolapsed womb which cannot otherwise be replaced, with the result that the fetus is aborted. This procedure would only be permissible on the principle of the double effect, but, in any case, the point is controverted.

II. On the supposition that the smaller tumor alone is infected, was the operation lawful?

Reply. If the smaller tumor had to be removed, and if it could have been safely removed without removing the womb and fetus, then it alone should have been removed, even if, later on, the mother's life would have been seriously endangered by progressing pregnancy or parturition, and even if the mother would certainly die pregnant or in child-birth, for if the excision of the womb was not necessary, the life of the fetus should not be endangered.

[3] Antonelli, *Medicina Pastoralis*, II, No. 110, Edit. 1909.

III. On the supposition that it is not known if the smaller tumor was infected, the surgeon should find out the state of the case, as far as possible. If he finds that he may leave the tumor and womb untouched without certainly endangering the mother's life, he may not perform the operation of excising womb and fetus in order to excise the tumor. The reason is, that in such a case, the fetus has a certain right to its life and the mother's life is not clearly and certainly imperiled by leaving things as they are.

10. Antonelli states that the question of how to treat ectopics is a matter of great moment and no small difficulty, for ectopic pregnancy, he says, always results in the death of the fetus and often in the death of the mother. He lays down the following principles of action:

(a) If it is unknown whether a tumor or an ectopic fetus is in situ, the surgeon must, as a rule, wait for evidence.

(b) If delay means grave peril to the life of the mother, and if it is not certain that a fetus is present, it is then permissible to perform the operation to save the mother, for it is directly sought to save the mother, an object that is immediately accomplished by the excision of the tumor. If a fetus was present, its consequent death was permitted. The justification given is that in the case of the mother, she has a certain right to her life, whereas the right to life of an uncertain fetus is not certain.

(c) If delay means grave peril to the life of the mother, and if a fetus is probably in situ, it is not permissible to pass an electric current or to inject morphia into the tumor, with the intention of destroying the fetus.

(d) If there is certainly a fetus in the tumor and the tumor is in imminent risk of bursting, with the certain consequence of death to the mother and fetus, it is disputed whether laparotomy is permissible in order to save the mother, though the fetus will certainly perish. The author appears to give it implicitly as his opinion that, if a fetus is not viable, the operation is condemned by the decrees of the Holy Office. We say that it is apparently his implicit opinion, for he merely shelters himself behind these decrees by saying: "habemus responsionem S. O. & C." But Antonelli wrote (ann. 1909) that modern theologians are practically unanimous in stating

that the said decrees do not condemn the operation, and this opinion is safe to act upon until the Sacred Congregation condemns a view, which, it must know, is commonly taught.

In the earlier edition of his work, (1905, p. 224) Antonelli gave it as his opinion that if there is certainly an inviable fetus present and the tube is in imminent risk of bursting, the operation of laparotomy is permissible on the analogy of the permissible excision of a pregnant womb infected with malignant tumors, if such operation is necessary in order to save the mother's life. He argued then, as do most theologians now.

11. Father Slater states: "if it is uncertain whether a cause of danger to a woman is an ectopic fetus or a tumor or some other growth, laparotomy may be performed and the cause of danger removed as soon as the danger becomes imminent. Even when the danger certainly comes from the presence of an ectopic fetus, the same operation may probably be performed when its growth causes the danger to the mother to be imminent and the fetus is already viable."

Again, he quotes Antonelli to the effect that it is lawful to remove an extrauterine fetus whose further growth would cause the certain death of the mother. Lastly: "A pregnant mother who is suffering from disease or tumor or any other complication which threatens life, may lawfully adopt the necessary means to save herself, even if what is a remedy for her causes the death of the fetus." The author must be understood, of course, to have been speaking of permissive death of the fetus and not at all of direct killing of the fetus, for he is, in both cases, applying the well known principles of the double effect.

12. Lehmkuhl thought that when the mother's life is endangered, as it is allowed to excise a diseased womb that contains a fetus, so in cases of ectopics, when the tumor is seriously dangerous to the mother's life, it is allowed to excise the tumor, though it contains a fetus not yet viable. Where the mother's life is not in danger, such excision is not allowed before the fetus is viable.

It is the writer's intention, in the October number, to draw some conclusions from the opinions of surgeons and the considered views of modern theologians here set forth.

HENRY DAVIS, S.J.

London, England.

MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS.

Chinese Catholic Life.

I went on a sick-call yesterday afternoon to a village in the mountains twelve miles away. I rashly counted on making the twenty-four miles before nightfall and took no Mass kit with me, but the heavy rain delayed us and it was dark when we arrived at the house. This is supposed to be the season of "soft rains, thank God," as they say in Ireland, but in this hill country of narrow valleys the brooks soon overflow and carry away the bridges. Twice we made detours where a bridge had been in use that morning. The calm, philosophic way in which the accident was viewed by my companion, and by the Chinese in general on other like occasions, marks the racial difference between us. Of course, this barefooted race thinks little of wading through a stream, while tenderfoots are not so keen. Even on terra firma my rubber soles give no purchase on dripping rocks, and I measured the plastic mud and carried away distinct impressions of its contact.

Although St. Christopher is patron now of autoists, it is a distinct pleasure over here to enact literally the original story. Carrying the Blessed Sacrament up and down these mountain paths has a quiet thrill and simplicity in it that somehow befits the priest in apostolic lands. If the passing of our Lord cured the sick in Palestine, surely here where He is needed most His trips through pagan villages will effect results.

As we approached the village the Christians spied us from afar and joined us in silence on the way. At the house itself, I found a group of Catholics making the Stations of the Cross, for the day was a Friday in Lent. I wondered in a humbled mood how many families in America or Europe living at a distance from the church were making the same stations.

Some day or other a courageous voice will dare to defend the thesis that the Church in China, from the point of view of laity, is the best organized. There are some telling arguments on this point that struck me as I knelt with the praying group. Religion is practised in China in a manly way by men and without the priest. By a manly way, I mean that the devotions are the solid ones of essential prayers: the liturgical prayers of Creed, Confiteor, of invocation of the Three Divine Persons,

and of Our Lady and St. Joseph, of attachment to the Passion and the Cross, that breathe the atmosphere of the Latin Fathers of the early centuries. Orientals though they are, they show their piety by little of eastern characteristics, except a tendency to mortification.

I am not much versed in history, but it strikes me that the nearest counterpart to Chinese Catholic life is that of the catacombs, or of Ireland under Cromwell. There is an absence of incense, or flowers, or processions, or images, or comfortable pews, or majestic swell or harmonized music, that marks the Church in China, at least in the interior, as belonging to a primitive age.

This simplicity may be due to the masculine character of the Church. Women have played but little part in the development of the Church over here, with the result that man has risen to the emergency and sustained his rôle. The men naturally take the front of the church, the women as an afterthought fit in near the doorway, wherever there is room. At first sight this may seem an outrage in modern times, but it has the happy effect of forcing men to take the leading part in services. The youth of China do not feel mollycoddled in kneeling in church. You know the rousing sight of a Holy Name Sunday in an American parish church,—that is our normal state over here, even when our chapels have but a handful of Catholics.

And though the priest the world over is the pivot connecting altar and nave, over here the people have been trained to pray without him to a great extent. This has its danger in lessening his influence for good, but it is overbalanced by bringing to the fore the prime need of personal prayer. There is less demand for clubs and societies, where the father directs the prayers of his family, where the men of a village take the initiative in collective religious action.

The happy foresight of our predecessors over here has equipped the small scattered Catholic communities with a form of worship without which many would have long since fallen away. It is a vindication of the old-fashioned method of teaching by memory work. I daresay there are relatively few Catholics in China who do not know the Creed, or the Ten Commandments of God and those of the Church, or the act of contrition. During March the congregation here recited the

Litany of St. Joseph from memory, as also the Litany of Loretto, daily. After Holy Communion they have a memorized series of thanksgiving prayers; for each action of the priest during Mass, many can follow with suitable prayers.

I know the value of private prayer and the dangerous routine of public ones and I do not claim too much for those of China, but at least they give the Christians a necessary mode of prayer in the long absence of the priest. This is, I think, a distinct contribution of the Chinese Church, which, if not original, is at least not merely theoretical, but put into practice. As pagans, whatever worship they indulged in was mostly a family affair, and as Catholics they have been wisely taught to retain this form.

Another point that struck me, as I knelt with mud-caked cassock in the grateful dark, is the refreshing habit the folk in these parts have of using their principal room as a chapel. (I dislike disparaging American Catholic life, but as one who saw America first and no other countries my terms of comparison are necessarily limited.) How many families at home display their faith thus openly? The best of us limit ourselves to a good copy of a Madonna in the parlor. This little parlor in a pagan village opened on the roadway and the doors are only closed at night. The furniture consisted of an altar and prie-Dieu, with chairs near the doorway for visitors, an image of the Sacred Heart, a crucifix and some inscriptions carved on wood hung from the walls. And the inscriptions are not in the style of the banal placards that rustics used to admire. The one over the altar states that here is worshipped the True Origin of the Universe, while others describe Him as the Creator of Heaven and Earth, of Spirits and Man and of all Things, without Beginning or End, without Likeness or Form, existing everywhere.

And, mind you, this is not the model house of the village church trustee, nor of a family beyond the average; these are barefoot farmers, who are so poor that yearly one or the other emigrates to the rubber plantations of Singapore.

The trip back next morning was a mild adventure. It had rained all night and still was going strong at four. Daylight now does not come until after five, but I wanted to be back for Mass at the seminary. We carried a feeble "ever-ready", but

Chinese puddles in the dark seem as firm as drier land until you test them. I would have liked to know the thoughts of my guide as I floundered, while he skipped lightly along. The path in parts was narrow and I did not disdain to hug the side of the cliff and edge along slowly.

And, as dawn revealed the beauty of these ravines and the pine trees, freshened by the rain, threw out their welcome, racy odor and the clouds still hung as background to the distant hills, I felt repaid for early rising. China in these parts is at its best at dawn. The freshness of the leaves, baptized with dew, somehow christianizes the scene, for our Faith is eternally young and promising. At daybreak, before pagan man begins to stir, China is God's alone and refreshing.

FRANCIS X. FORD, A.F.M.

Kaying, China.

WHERE THE CHOICE OF A CATECHISM IS ALL IMPORTANT.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Whenever a discussion arises concerning the merits or demerits of the catechism in use, there is always someone to come forward and remind us that the success of a class depends much more on the teacher than on the text book. The inference we are left to gather is that, after all, it does not matter so much whether or not the text book we are using is decidedly inferior, when compared with others available.

We shall have no difficulty in agreeing, one and all, that the teacher should be above the text book, that a capable teacher will do good work with almost any kind of text book, and that our parish-school children, at the end of eight years with a competent teacher, will know their religion fairly well if there were no catechism in use at all. On the other hand, it is equally true that a really successful teacher is just the last one to tolerate an inferior text book in his class-room. As a result, the best teachers in every department are persistently busy improving the character of the text books in use, getting rid of what is objectionable and devoting untold energy to the production of new ones. It is teachers of outstanding capacity to whom we are indebted for the many wonderful reforms in school books during the past forty years or more. Similarly,

it is safe to assert that the parish-school teachers who to-day are doing the best work in classes of religious instruction will be the first to clamor, and the loudest in their clamor, for a better catechism.

Two Million Children for whom a Simpler Catechism is absolutely necessary.

But while admitting the principle that the teacher should be superior to the text book, we cannot fail to recognize that a large majority of those obliged to instruct children in their religion are, and to a great extent must be, dependent on the catechism. Only a minority can attempt anything more than the simple recitation of the matter therein.

In the first place, parents, all parents, are bound to teach religion. No matter how efficient our schools, religious formation obtains chiefly in the home. We all subscribe to this, and all the more readily as our experience expands. But, few parents are trained teachers or know anything about method. The generality must depend almost entirely on the text book.

Many Catholic school teachers are young girls, devoted, capable, owing much to their normal school training; it is true nevertheless, with little or no opportunity for a profound study of Catholic doctrine, in many cases themselves trained in public schools, primary, high and normal, and, therefore, altogether diffident of venturing beyond a recitation of the book prescribed.

In the United States there are two million Catholic children attending public schools. Only a small fraction of these have regular instruction in religion from skilled teachers.

Children not in Parish Schools overlooked.

We seem to have entirely forgotten about those two million children. Rarely are they given any place in our plans. Little or no provision is made in consideration of their peculiar circumstances. In all our arguments, discussions, suggestions, proposals, affecting religious instruction, in the experiences recounted, methods outlined, text books recommended, etc., it is always the religious instruction carried on in parish schools we have in mind. Beyond this, we have no vision or visualizing. Consequently, when there is question of a catechism or

change of catechism, we find ourselves, instinctively as it were, maintaining that it is the teacher that counts, not the text book that he or she uses. We lose sight of the two million children who, for the most part, have no teacher of religion.[1]

Now, since the religious instruction of these immense numbers will be confined almost entirely to acquainting themselves with the contents of the catechism, it surely is of first importance that the very best catechism in existence be selected for their use. There should be no haphazard in this particular. That a good teacher can get results even with a catechism too difficult for the children is no reason for imposing the same book on children who have no skilled teacher. If they are to make progress at all, it goes without saying that they must understand the answers they are obliged to learn.

That picture of the less gifted child, in tears and hopelessness, trying over and over again to memorize long catechism answers of meaningless words and phrases, the conscientious parent sympathetically, patiently but sternly keeping the child at the task, would be too pathetic to recall, were it not for the sadder fact that even down to this hour we have continued subjecting both to the same painful and unprofitable experiences. If the child succeed in his task he has, as Bishop Bellord says, learned some catechism, but he has not learned any religion. No one will dispute that he would be learning something about his religion if the answers he committed to memory were in a language he understood.

The old puzzle remains unanswered: Why are children obliged to use a catechism whose language they cannot understand?

A Catechism in Simple Language not impossible.

To this puzzle I can venture only one solution. For some reason or other there is generally prevalent a deep-rooted conviction that Christian truth can not be presented in simple language. It is taken for granted that a catechism must contain numberless words and phrases beyond the mental calibre of the child. Catechisms in the past were so invariably redolent of this characteristic that we have come to look upon it

[1] A study of organized instruction in this field will appear in our October issue.—Editor.

as inevitable. Our conception is constantly reflecting itself in the phrases "explaining the catechism", "explanation of the catechism", etc. This is supposed to be the chief duty of the catechist. As a consequence of the conviction, new works enlarging upon the text, commentaries, etc., in endless variety, are regularly coming from the press. Does it never occur to anyone that the very existence, the very necessity of such productions is *prima facie* evidence of the inferiority and defectiveness of the work on which they are based.

To take issue with the widespread conviction that a catechism directly intelligible to children must be an impossibility is the distinct purpose of this paper. The writer maintains, without the slightest qualification, that catechisms can be written in language in which every question and every answer will be perfectly clear in meaning to the ordinary child. *A priori* arguments supporting this position may be of little avail. Anyone determined to see for himself has only to examine certain catechisms written and published in our own country. The number may be extensive; I can refer the inquirer to four:—

How to Teach our Little Ones (F. H. McHough & Son, Grand Rapids).

The Junior Catechism (John P. Daleiden Co., Chicago).

The Baltimore Catechism Revised (Wm. H. Sadlier, New York).

The New Method of Religious Instruction (St. John's Church, Lockport).

I have used all four extensively. The class of religious instruction is no longer a painful drudgery for both child and teacher. There is no further difficulty in securing interest.

MISSIONARIUS.

CHURCH AND STATE IN EDUCATION.

The June number of *Religious Education* reports in a comprehensive manner the discussions and findings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Convention of The Religious Education Association which was held in Chicago, April 26-29. For the religious educator this volume is of prime importance as it outlines views on a problem which, sooner or later, must be attacked and solved in a manner satisfactory to the different

elements which go to make up the vast and complex country which is the United States.

Protestantism has only quite recently come to see the need of clarifying its fundamental views on the relations of the state and church to education. During the last century it had the Sunday School as an organized medium for training children religiously. Since the Sunday School is a privately conducted and privately supported institution, its existence did not raise the problem of the relations of Protestantism to the state in the field of education. But the Sunday School has been thoroughly discredited, and Protestant educators are now advocating as a substitute some type of alignment with public education.

On the other hand, the problem of the relation of the parish school with the state has always existed and, through a century of thinking and of critical analysis, Catholics have come to a set of clearly defined positions on the question.

It will be interesting to know what conclusions Protestant religious educators finally accept. But the pages of the present number of *Religious Education* will not enlighten us much as to these possible conclusions. Protestant opinion is in the making; in many fundamentals it already approaches the Catholic attitude and, given a decade more of discussion and of experimentation, the probabilities all are that we can safely look forward to an approximation of views or, at least, to an acceptable basis for a practical working out of the religious and public educational problem.

The papers read by public-school men on the educational function of the state reflected the customary attitude, tempered here and there by an admission that religion is necessary to vital education. Most public-school educators seem to labor under the old impression that 'character education' is a valid substitute for religious training. It is gratifying to learn from the papers of Professors Sherwood, Merrill, and Engleman that their colleagues are beginning to think seriously about the problem and are calling into question many of the principles which they were accustomed to accept hitherto as axiomatic.

There seemed to be almost general agreement on the need of religion in education, despite the fact, or perhaps because of the fact, that nowhere was the term 'religion' given a very

definite meaning. Sir Robert A. Falconer, of Toronto, expressed this view when he stated: "I proceed to affirm that religious people cannot regard any education as complete that does not include religion in it." Professor Weigle of Yale also pointed this out in the clearest terms, and as a practical conclusion affirmed: "Catholic and Protestant alike desire the moral and religious education of their children. They differ in that the Catholic holds that the whole of education, to be religiously motivated and morally effective, must be in the hands of the Church; whereas the Protestant believes that the Church can so coöperate with the public school as to make religion effective in education, even though the whole process be not under Church control. The Catholic has fairly well established the proof of at least part of his theory; it does succeed in training good Catholics. It remains for the Protestant to prove that his theory will work."

At the convention there were many criticisms of religious education pronounced by public-school men, criticisms which were mostly founded on mere theory and not on a personal and scientific study of the work of the religious school. The religious educator, also, was given his inning and in three papers written from the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish points of view the limitations of the public school were frankly discussed. Dr. James H. Ryan of the Catholic University of America emphasized the philosophical, psychological, educational, and religious limitations of public education, limitations which are real and result from the very foundation principles of the public school, "despite the fact that in some countries the national school has not followed out these principles to their logical conclusions or that, due to the prevalence of Christian traditions and thought, the full consequences of the nationalist theory have not been experienced". The Protestant spokesman, Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, called his view that of "a Protestant Catholic" and affirmed that he occupied "the area of a man who accepts the Catholic position". Rabbi Mann was frankly secularist in his viewpoint, and though holding that "the ultimate sanction of morality is religion and that religious training is essential to good citizenship", expressed the deep-set fear that any rapprochement of the state to the church in the field of education would

entail destruction of the principle of separation of church and state.

All three speakers gave utterance to viewpoints concerning public education which, had they been uttered ten years ago, would have been looked upon almost as traitorous to the accepted and current interpretations of so-called American doctrines. But educational opinion has advanced no small distance in the last decade toward a place from which we may proceed to a sane and practical solution of the religious education problem. This is particularly true with reference to Protestant opinion which has undergone an almost revolutionary change of front, both with regard to its ideas of what religious education means and how it is to be promoted and with regard to the place and function of the state in the general educational scheme.

SOLEMN BAPTISM BY CHAPLAIN.

Qu. The January issue of the REVIEW, pp. 93 ff., discusses a question which is, indeed, preëminently practical. The case briefly stated is this:

A chaplain appointed at an institution (hospital, orphanage, etc.) cannot assist at marriages or baptize solemnly by virtue of his appointment, but he can do both if appointed with full pastoral powers whereby he is exempted from the jurisdiction of the pastor within whose territory said institution is located.

As to assisting at marriages, I see no difficulty since the bishop possesses the power to exempt institutions in the way indicated; the chaplain then acts as the delegate of the bishop and this is sufficient for valid assistance at a marriage (other conditions are not considered here).

But in regard to solemn baptism the case seems to be different, since not only "minister debitus" is required by law, but also "locus debitus," which is a church or a public oratory, with the exclusion of a semi-public oratory. The chapels of the aforesaid institutions are, as a rule, semi-public oratories. "Oratorium est semi-publicum, si in commodum alicujus communitatis vel coetus fidelium eo convenientium erectum sit, neque liberum cuique sit illud adire" (Can. 1182, § 2). Solemn baptism is, indeed, one of the functions reserved to the pastor: "Functiones parocho reservatae sunt, nisi aliud jure caveatur, Baptismum conferre sollemniter" (Can. 462, § 1). Nor does the Code contain anything to the contrary. The same precept is repeated in Canon 738, § 1. But be-

sides the "debitus minister", the Code determines the "debitus locus": "Proprius baptismi sollemnis administrandi locus est baptisterium in ecclesia vel oratorio publico" (Can. 773). This canon is plain and leaves no doubt as to the proper place of solemn baptism.

Can it be said then that exemption, which gives the chaplain full pastoral powers, raises the semi-public oratory to the rank of a church or public oratory I should think not, as the canonical requirements for a church (Can. 1161) or a public oratory (Can. 1188, § 2) differ widely from those of a semi-public oratory.

Nor can it be presumed that the above exemption, while leaving the chapel in its *status quo*, by virtue of the exemption enjoys the privilege of a *fons baptismalis*, since the powers of the bishops are restricted in so far that they may allow a *fons baptismalis* outside the parish church, but only in a church or public oratory.

Furthermore, Can. 1193 rules that in semi-public oratories all divine offices and ecclesiastical functions may be celebrated unless the rubrics or the rulings of the Ordinary state otherwise.

Now as to solemn baptism, the Rituale Romanum does state otherwise. Using the very words of Can. 773 we read: "Proprius baptismi sollemnis administrandi locus est Baptisterium in ecclesia vel oratorio publico" (Tit. II, C. I, No. 42).

Thus it would appear, that according to law no priest may solemnly baptize in a semi-public oratory, be he the parochus proprius of the place, or any other pastor or chaplain with or without full pastoral powers; the reason being that the proper place for administering solemn baptism is the parish church in the first place, or any church or public oratory, regardless of the status of the "minister baptismi."

N. S.

Resp. N. S. proposes a difficulty which seems to have escaped the attention of the compilers of the Code. The "status quaestionis" is clear. A hospital, for instance, is a semi-public oratory. This is apparent, not only from Canon 1182 § 2, but in the decree of 23 January, 1899 (*A. S. S.*, xxxi-412) from which semi-public oratories take their origin, hospitals are expressly designated as semi-public oratories. As N. S. points out, semi-public oratories are not included in Canon 773 where the Code specifies the proper place for baptism; only churches and public oratories are mentioned. As an additional complication, when the Code designates the proper place for mar-

riage, the semi-public oratory is included and expressly mentioned as a proper place, thus giving the impression that it was purposely omitted as the proper place for baptism. Furthermore, in Canon 776 § 1, the Ordinary may permit the administration of baptism in a private oratory; again the semi-public oratory receives no mention.

Was it the intention of the compilers of the Code to exclude entirely the semi-public oratory, such as the chapel of a hospital, from the administration of baptism? Was the omission of the semi-public oratory a "lapsus" on their part, or can the semi-public oratory in some way be included, though not expressly mentioned?

The commentators generally maintain an ominous silence. Mothon (*Inst. Can.*, II, 1696) seems to take the public oratory of 774 § 2, in the generic sense, as opposed to private oratories. "The bishop, the Ordinary of the place, can permit or command the erection of baptismal fonts in all churches and in public or semi-public oratories, for the convenience of the faithful." He thus inserts "semi-public oratories" in his commentary, though it is not found in the text. It may also be argued from the "comparatio a minori," that if the bishop, outside of cases of necessity, may permit the administration of baptism in private oratories, something more should be accorded semi-public oratories.

The custom of administering baptism in hospitals is rather widespread. Mothers in increasing numbers are seeking the safeguards of the Catholic hospital at childbirth, and it is occasionally a great inconvenience to bring the child to the church of the parents for baptism. In this case, if the chaplain has pastoral powers, should the baptism in the hospital be forbidden on the ground that it is a semi-public oratory, and hence, not the proper place for baptism? We think not. It is more reasonable to suppose that the semi-public oratory is included in the term "public" of 774, as a proper place for baptism; in no canon is the administration of baptism in semi-public oratories expressly forbidden. The only other alternative is to class the semi-public oratory with the private oratory as a permissible place of baptism, an alternative which does not harmonize with the character of the semi-public oratory.

ADMINISTERING HOLY COMMUNION IN DIFFERENT ROOMS OF AN INSTITUTION.

Q. Father Franciscus is in charge of a hospital (an old peoples' home, rather), where he is required to carry Holy Communion to the sick in bed in their own rooms. For the sake of simplification, he dispenses himself from saying the specially provided prayers ("Pax huic domui," etc., with Asperges, the sprinkling of water, etc.). Upon the recitation of the Confiteor in the chapel, he recites the "Misereatur" . . . "Indulgentiam" . . . etc., and then takes the ciborium and goes through the three floors of the institution, distributing Holy Communion to those waiting to receive it.

Father Gallus, his confrère, objects to this practice, insisting that the Church, in prescribing certain definite prayers for the occasion, surely intends to have them said at every recurrence of such an occasion under ordinary circumstances (for instance, those that prevail in the institution under consideration). Therefore, to his mind it is essential that the Blessed Sacrament should be taken from the church to one of the rooms of the sick, and that there all the prayers prescribed should be recited; or that, preferably, all the prayers should be recited at a little altar erected in the corridor adjoining the chapel (the adjoining sick-rooms would thus be considered as constituting a single moral unit. There would be a further advantage in thus avoiding the odors of certain sick-rooms).

Father Fredericus, another confrère, objects to this latter use (i. e., that beginning with "preferably"), saying that there are no sick immediately present at such an altar, and that for this reason the whole procedure is nonsensical. He suggests that the proper thing to do would be to follow the practice of Franciscus, with the exception that the latter person should recite all the prayers as provided by the Church, so that in this way all things might be decently fulfilled according to the mind of the Church.

Father Pirminianus, another confrère, ridicules this last suggestion of Fredericus, saying that such a procedure would be the most nonsensical of all, since evidently the priest could not say the "Pax huic domui" directly before the altar, neither could he sprinkle the water, etc., there: this latter, he thinks, would be the greatest folly of all.

I personally would support the "preferable" opinion of Gallus, for the reason that he gives, and because I personally find this practice to be in vogue in nearly all hospitals I know of. But what is your opinion?

Resp. There is only one correct method of administering Holy Communion to the sick, and that is in accordance with the

prescriptions of the Roman Ritual. The ceremonies prescribed in the Ritual consist of the salutation and "Asperges," the "Confiteor," "Misereatur" and "Indulgentiam," the administration, the prayer "Domine Sancte," and the blessing. None of these ceremonies can be omitted except for a grave reason. The Ritual allows two exceptions. When death is imminent, the priest may begin with the "Misereatur," omitting what precedes, and when several are to receive in the same room ("in eodem cubiculo") the recent changes in the Ritual (14, 19) permit what commentators have long held (O'Kane, 841, Van der Stappen, II, 213), viz. the priest is allowed to say the prayers once only, in the plural number. In accordance with the teaching of the same, this practice may also be followed where the rooms open one into the other, provided the communicants may see or hear the priest as he recites the prayers.

It is apparent that the Ritual commands that the communicants be present to the priest as he recites the prayers. They should therefore at least be able to see or hear him in order to fall under the exception. Otherwise the communicant is deprived of the immediate preparation for Holy Communion which the Ritual desires that he have. This immediate preparation serves a double purpose. Through the prayers of the priest devotion is increased and contrition is excited in the communicant for the remission of sin. That the absolution of the priest is not sacramental is clear from the form, which is deprecative, and not indicative, and also from the fact that it is recited by a deacon who administers Communion as well as by a priest. A priest who does not recite the prescribed prayers in each separate administration acts counter to the Ritual and deprives the communicant of the opportunity for divine grace to which he has a right.

After all, a patient in a hospital should expect the same pastoral care as a patient in his own home. Whatever the number of persons desiring to receive Communion in their homes, no priest would even consider reciting the preparatory prayers only in the first home, and the concluding prayer only in the last home. He repeats the prayers each time without question. A priest should administer Communion in an institution as he administers in private homes. The practice of

rushing into distinct rooms of a hospital and immediately administering Holy Communion should be regarded as an abuse. The only justification alleged is that time is saved, but it is saved at the expense of cherished ceremonies, and the omission is not infrequently a source of much disedification. The great event of the patient's day is compressed within the shortest possible space of time.

For each administration of Holy Communion in distinct rooms, the prayers must be repeated, unless an indult be secured to omit them. When Holy Communion is administered to several in one room, as in a ward, or even in a corridor, if the doors of the adjoining rooms are open and the patients are present to the priest, the prayers may be said once only in the plural number.

The method advocated by Franciscus is wrong. The prayers should be repeated, if not in every room, at least on each corridor, provided the adjoining doors are open. The first suggestion of Gallus is incorrect; his second suggestion is in harmony with the Ritual, provided the patients are present to the priest, so that they can see or hear him, and unite with him in the prayers. Fredericus in following Franciscus is wrong, unless he supposes the repetition of the prayers in each distinct administration.

BENEFICE OF ASSISTANT PASTORATE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The teaching offered in the July issue of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, under the caption of "Benefice of Assistant Pastorate", regarding the canonical status of our parochial curacies and parochial curates, commonly so called, is so revolutionary and unwarranted by good jurisprudence that it cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. The writer of the article in question made the amazing assertion that "the removal of our Assistant Pastors is no longer a purely arbitrary matter, left to the caprice of our Bishops", but, because these vicariates are "beneficialia", "the removal of those who possess them is ad normam juris". With this teaching that the office of our curates is a benefice, in the canonical sense of the word, we must insistently and decidedly take issue.

As the questioner who provoked the article under consideration well and clearly pointed out, it is the absence of the element of "objectiva perpetuitas", required by Canon 1409, that stands in the way of our "vicariae paroeciales" being true benefices. It is on this rock that the writer of the article under discussion comes to grief. Unless there can be offered clear and convincing proof that our curacies have been erected in perpetuity, the claim of the writer is of course absolutely groundless.

To prove that our curacies enjoy the essential requisite of objective perpetuity, i. e. of having been set up in perpetuity, the writer offers the "universal custom of American Bishops in regularly filling these offices when vacated, and assigning a fixed salary to them". In support of this contention he mentions some diocesan synods in the decrees of which he says "assistant pastorates are formally constituted", and "a definite salary determined for those who hold these offices". He evidently considers that the assignment of a curate to a parish *ipso facto* constitutes a formal erection of a benefice. But, of course, the recognition of the existence of curates as a class and the assignment of a fixed stipend to be paid by the parish which they serve should not, and cannot, be urged as constituting the formal erection of *each* curacy into the juridical status of a benefice.

And if the practice of the Right Reverend Bishops whose diocesan synods are cited in support of the "status beneficialis" of our curacies be investigated, it would be undoubtedly clear that they at least do not consider the several curacies held by the respective curates in their dioceses to be by any means formally erected in perpetuity. On the contrary, they continue, ad normam canon. 477-1, to remove such curates *ad nutum*. Let it be said in passing that "ad nutum episcopi" does not mean "at the caprice of the bishop" as said by the author of this new teaching, but rather "at the will of the bishop" governed by his prudent judgment.

The Right Reverend Bishops have always considered the curates as constituting a mobile force at the service of the diocese for which they were ordained, to be assigned to the various parts of the diocese according as the local needs required. When in the prudent judgment of the bishop the re-

moval of a curate has been deemed advisable, without any further process of law he has been simply notified of his removal either orally or by letter. And this practice they can still continue safely to follow as long as the status of our curacies remains in their present form.

The Code itself recognizes the parochial curates as a class, and decrees that congruous remuneration be given them for their labor; but even a short study of the Code will convince one that it has not thereby established them as benefices, save in exceptional cases which we shall now consider.

Although the normal curacy is not a benefice, a curacy may by exception be erected into a benefice. But this is possible only in the case of a division of a parochial benefice. When a parish priest is unable alone to take due care of his flock because of the great number of souls in his parish, or for other recognized causes, the Code commands that he be given one or more curates, and that a suitable remuneration be given to them for their services (Can. 476). This is what is ordinarily done. The appointment of such curates, however, by no means constitutes the erection of a canonical benefice; and the Code itself anticipates the mistake of the writer under discussion when it says in Canon 1412: "although they offer some similarity to benefices, parochial curacies not erected in perpetuity do not, however, come under the name of benefices in law".

The curacy which is erected in perpetuity and becomes a benefice is described in Canon 1427 as an exceptional form of curacy. When parishioners find great difficulty in reaching the parish church, or when the number of parishioners is so great that, even with the help of the curates provided for in Canon 476, the parish priest cannot adequately provide for his flock, there is a canonical reason for a division of the parochial benefice. In making this division the bishop may either make an entirely new parish or set up a perpetual curacy. Inasmuch as this curacy is thereby endowed with the note of perpetuity it is essentially different from the curacy to which the curate mentioned in Canon 476 is assigned. The failure to understand this distinction between the curates normally assigned to aid the parish priest (Canon 476) and those provided for in the division of a parish has led the writer of the article in the July issue of the REVIEW to apply Canon 477-2 to all curates

indiscriminately, and to consider every curate as the holder of a perpetual curacy. The perpetual curacies are regularly set up only where there is a canonical cause for the division of a parish, whereas the other curacies are found where no such division is justified.

In the light of this distinction we can understand why Canon 477-1 says that curates are "amovibiles ad nutum episcopi"; but if the curacy is a benefice (Canon 477-2) the curate is removable only for the same reasons as apply in the case of parish priests, save that grave failure to show due obedience to his own parish priest constitutes an added reason for removal of a holder of a "benefice curacy".

Taking absolute issue, then, with the writer of the article in the July number of the REVIEW, we can certainly conclude that, although our parochial curacies may, as the Code itself points out in Canon 1412, have some appearance of benefices, they do not come under the name of benefice in law; and that furthermore, and in consequence, our parochial curates, as the Code clearly expresses it in Canon 477-1, can be removed "ad nutum episcopi".

VINDEX.

REPLY.

The author of the article "Benefice of Assistant Pastorate" which appeared in the July number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW did not intend to introduce a revolutionary doctrine with regard to the juridical status of so-called parochial curates. It was his intention merely to determine the juridical nature of "Vicarii cooperatores" according to the general principles of Canon Law. The doctrine contained in said article is based upon the teaching of reliable and approved canonists, such as Murga, Laymann, Bouix, Vidal, Vermeersch, and Maroto. That doctrine may seem new, indeed, to "Vindex", but it is neither revolutionary nor unwarranted.

"Vindex" confines his criticism to the defect of one essential condition of a benefice: namely "objectiva perpetuitas". It is in order to show that the "munus" of "Vicarius cooperator", as it exists to-day in the United States, does possess perpetuity of institution. And according to Vermeersch, "perpetuitas institutionis" is all that is required by C. 1409 for the objective

perpetuity of a benefice.[1] This perpetuity of institution can and frequently does exist without *continuity*. Thus for example the office of Vicarius Capitularis *de jure* is of perpetual institution, although there is not always *de facto* a vicar capitular. The continuity of a given benefice of the kind under discussion is an entirely different matter, and is a question which might be discussed in connexion with "provisio canonica". "Vindex" fails to make this distinction, else he would not have made the statement: "He evidently considers that the assignment of a curate to a parish *ipso facto* constitutes a formal erection of a benefice." Hence Vermeersch very well says: "Unde, hodie saltem, cum subiectiva perpetuitas non sit necessaria, etiam officio v. g. Legati vel Vicarii capitularis ius percipiendi reditus ex dote coniungi possit, ita ut beneficium exsurgat, si auctoritate Ecclesiae coniunctio facta sit". (l. c.)

As stated in the July number of the REVIEW, this conjunction of the two constitutive elements of a benefice, namely "officium sacrum" and "ius ad reditus" is done in legal form by competent ecclesiastical authority, when our Bishops in Synod define the "munus vicarii cooperatoris" and affix to it a stable revenue "ex dote paroeciae". By this synodal legislation the conditions of legitimate erection are verified (CC. 1415, 1416) and the form of erection as described in C. 1418 is sufficiently observed. But may the "officium vicarii cooperatoris" be therefore said to be erected "in perpetuum". If the term "perpetuum" is taken in its right sense, the perpetuity of institution required for a benefice seems to be verified in the case of the office of Vicarius cooperator as it exists among us.

According to Laymann the word "perpetuum" may be understood in two ways: "primo, quod beneficium legitime collatum auferri non possit, nisi gravi causa postulante. Verum si ita intelligatur definitio [of a benefice, understood], non comprehendit beneficia manualia, (e. g. paroeciae amovibiles) quae tamen vere beneficia sunt . . . Secundo explicari potest, quod beneficium dicatur perpetuum, saltem secundum aptitudinem: quomodo omnia Principis beneficia perpetua esse dicuntur, quia durant, donec auferantur, seu revocentur" (Lib. I, tract. II, c. 1). "Perpetuum" understood in this sense admits of the distinction: "beneficium simpliciter titulare et bene-

[1] Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 742, ed. 1925.

ficium manuale". A "beneficium simpliciter titulare" is defined: "beneficium quod in titulum perpetuum confertur, ut beneficium sine gravi et iusta causa auferri non possit, sive per legem sive per iudicis sententiam. Beneficium manuale, quod in titulum quidem confertur, sed revocabiliter". (Laymann, l. c.)

According to the doctrine of Murga[2] some vicariates (curacies) are perpetual, others are temporal. "Perpetui sunt, qui ab Episcopo investiuntur, congrua illis redituum portione constituta, ita ut amoveri non possint, nisi per privationem aut depositionem, ob causam iure expressam". (Laymann, l. c., n. 8. To this species belong the "vicariae beneficiales" of CC. 476-1427. Canon 476 determines when such vicariates should be erected, the extent of a curate's powers, attaches a revenue to his office. Vidal states: Vicarius cooperator "constituitur ob causam permanentem seu semper relate ad determinatam paroeciam specialis conditionis permanentis" (De Personis, p. 791). For this reason the office of "vicarius cooperator" enjoys sufficient stability to be said to be of perpetual erection. Whereas, "vicarii temporales sunt, qui ad tempus constituuntur, v. g. ob absentiam, infirmitatem, graves occupationes, suspensionem beneficiati" (Laymann, l. c.). To this class belong the "vicarii" of CC. 473-474-475. It is patent to all that there is a vast difference between a curate of this kind and a "vicarius cooperator", who is not sent to supply the absence of a pastor, but as a vice-gerent of a pastor, who "ratione officii parochi vicem supplere eumque adiuvare in universo paroeciali ministerio, excepta applicatione Missae pro populo" (C. 476). Hence Abb. in c. extirpandae, says: "vicarium perpetuum in parochiali ecclesia constitutum est vere curatum quoad exercitium et effectum, licet quoad habitum et proprietatem, cura sit penes rectorem principalem". Thus the supposed distinction between the curacies described in CC. 476 and 1427 becomes a "distinctio sine re". In reality they are the same juridical entities considered under different aspects: C. 476 considers the "vicarius cooperator" as a "persona". C. 1427 speaks of the same "persona moralis" as a "res mixta" and determines the canonical reasons for constituting this office perpetually.

[2] *De Beneficiis*, l. I, c. I.

With regard to offices of this kind it is necessary to keep in mind the distinction noted by Maroto: "Distinguenda sunt officia in genere, nimirum genus aut species alicuius officii, et singula numerice officia ad genus illud pertinentia. Officia ipsa in genere suo solent esse constituta *a iure* vel lege, quae eorum naturam, iura, obligationes, etc. quoad substantiam determinat et statuit; deinde singula numerice officia eriguntur, innovantur, supprimuntur *ab homine*, nempe aliquo Superiore, qui etiam auctoritati illius iuris vel legis esse potest subditus. Ita officium Episcoporum in genere fuit institutum a iure divino, non ita singuli Episcopatus qui constituuntur, etc. a Romano Pontifice; similiter a iure ecclesiastico communi habentur plura officia in genere constituta, v. g. parochi, quae postmodum numerice multiplicantur vel vi ipsius iuris sine speciali actu hominis, v. g. officium Vicarii Capitularis, vel ab homine, idest pro diversitate officiorum . . . , item a iure particulari, imprimis dioecesano, possunt esse instituta in genere nonnulla officia ecclesiastica, quae deinde numerice ad homine erigantur" (*Institutiones,* p. 679). And this is what happens when curacies are instituted in synod: the office is erected generically, which gives it perpetuity of erection; it is multiplied specifically "ab homine", i. e. by the bishop according as the needs of the diocese demand.

Now it is an accepted principle of canon law: "ubi est ius exigendi reditus ob ministerium sacrum, Ecclesiae auctoritate constitutum, ibi est beneficium".[3] But a parish given by a bishop to a priest in titulum, even revocably, has "ius exigendi reditus ob sacrum ministerium auctoritate Ecclesiae constitutum". Therefore a parish of this kind is a benefice. The major "cum consequentia" is patent. The minor is proved thus: by the will of the bishop due to his sacred functions are conceded to a priest "obventiones annuae de reditibus paroeciae", with obligations and rights as defined in diocesan law, until the appointment is revoked. In other words, it is given "in titulum revocabilem", which suffices for the objective perpetuity of a benefice according to the teaching of approved canonists.

[3] Murga, *Tract. de Benef.,* Q. I, dub. ii, n. 26.

RESTITUTION TO BONDING COMPANY.

Qu. A young man was bonded for two thousand dollars on entering a business firm. A year passed and he was found to have defrauded the firm of four thousand dollars. He is sentenced to a year in prison. The bonding company paid the two thousand dollars for which it was liable.

The foregoing case was discussed at a gathering of clergy. Some of those present maintained that the young man has to restore the two thousand dollars to the surety company besides making good the other two thousand due his employers and not covered by the bond. Others who took part in the discussion held that the young man has to repay only the two thousand still due his employer—not covered by the bond; and need pay nothing to the surety company at all.

Will you kindly decide the doubt in this case?

J. L. E.

Resp. The young man has undoubtedly incurred the obligation of restoring the amount by which he is richer through his dishonesty—the four thousand dollars of which he defrauded his employers. The payment by the bonding company does not extinguish this obligation in law or in conscience. The bonding company succeeds to all the rights of the employer in the money that was reimbursed. They can proceed against the convicted man legally, and he is under obligation in conscience to indemnify them.

It may be objected that a surety company insures a man's honesty, just as a fire-insurance concern insures one's property. If the building burns down, the insurance company, having assumed the risk, must pay the amount agreed on; and so, if the man proves dishonest, the bonding firm, having assumed the risk for a stipulated consideration, should pay the specified indemnity, and the matter should end. When, however, a man maliciously fires his house with the intention of securing the insurance money, he is bound to restitution. Likewise, a man who is bonded, and who defrauds his employer, is guilty of injustice to the bonding company, and incurs the obligation of restitution. If, through no fault of his own, he had become the innocent means of loss to his employer, there would be no obligation in conscience to restitution, as the basis of the obligation, the "culpa theologica", would be absent.

SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT EXTRAVAGANCES.

I.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Unless we can agree on a certain uniformity of standard and practice in such annual affairs as the Closing Exercises of our schools, it is natural to expect that here and there elaborateness and thoughtless expense will crop out. Parish schools graduating their eighth-graders will vie with high schools, preparatory schools with colleges, and the latter will not want to play second fiddle to the university. And the heights attained by one unthinking Sister Superior or Father Rector will be sought or even passed by another. So the race to "keep up with the Joneses" will go on from one extravagance to another, with never a thought of the financial burthen put on many a parent who can't afford it, but who can't afford either to let his boy or girl stand apart from his or her fellow graduates.

Of recent years one has noticed a tendency not only to put unnecessary expense on the graduates, but also to emphasize the social and publicity features of these functions rather than their academic meaning and purpose. It would be well if the letter in your July issue should cause a little reflection on the part of pastors and school superiors in this respect and so lead us back to the old-time simplicity and restraint on Commencement Day.

DOCENS.

II.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The timely caution in the July REVIEW on the growing costs of the school graduation program leads me to mention the wise rule adopted by a neighbor of mine, across the river. He has, by force of circumstances, a high school, besides the eight primary grades. If I take the liberty of referring to his practice in this matter, it is not merely because I believe it to be a good one, but also because I feel sure he may probably not write himself about it.

No graduate is asked or permitted to contribute more than ten dollars toward the costs of the Commencement Exercises. This sum must cover the diploma, invitations, the printed program, the class pin or emblem, the music, the decorations, and

other incidental expenses. A simple, becoming and inexpensive uniform is prescribed for all graduates alike. The pastor knows the home circumstances of each graduate and has a fund from which he pays the fee should it bear hard on any parent. Engraved invitations are taboo; so are bouquets for the graduates. The exercises are held in the school itself, and not in a public hall or theatre. Withal, there is no sacrifice of dignity, even though there is no pretence. It is just a Catholic school ceremony, with all the proprieties, religious as well as scholastic.

LAUDATOR.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

2 Feby., 1927: The Right Rev. Monsignor Francis M. Orr, of the Diocese of Leavenworth, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

2 Feby.: Mr. Thomas J. Maloney, of the Diocese of Newark, Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

4 May: The Right Rev. Monsignor William Berg, of the Diocese of Fort Wayne, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

24 May: The Right Rev. Monsignor James F. McGloin, of the Diocese of Buffalo, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

24 May: The Right Rev. Monsignor Peter J. Dunne, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, Mo., Privy Chamberlain supernumerary of His Holiness.

27 May: Dr. James Walsh Benson, of the Diocese of Middlesborough, Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

20 June: The Right Rev. Monsignor Charles Payne, of the Diocese of Nottingham, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness.

THE ROSARY DEVOTIONS DURING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER.

Qu. Although we have daily Mass in our church, only a few of the parishioners and the school sisters can attend and receive Communion. It has been our custom, however, to have the children gather in the church later in the forenoon to recite the Rosary, Litany of the Blessed Virgin and Prayer to St. Joseph before the Blessed Sacrament exposed.

Could we have another devotion of the same kind in the evening when the majority of our people who work in the factories or stores could conveniently attend? My doubt is about having exposition of the Blessed Sacrament twice on the same day.

Resp. The doubt might be solved to the advantage of all parties by having private exposition with the ciborium in the morning, that is, opening the tabernacle door while reciting the prayers and then giving the blessing with ciborium at the end to the school children. Later in the evening the Solemn Benediction and Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, recitation of the Rosary and chant could be repeated without any special privilege to that effect from the Ordinary.

INDULGENCE FOR THE PRAYER TO ST. JOSEPH.

Qu. There is a special Indulgence (of seven years) attached to the public recitation of the prayer to St. Joseph each time during the month of October. Does this Indulgence continue, if the prayer is recited at other times during the year?

Resp. A separate Indulgence of 300 days, once a day, is granted for the recitation of the prayer to St. Joseph distinct from the Rosary devotions during October. (S. C. Indul., 21 Sept., 1899).

OFFICE OF THE TITULAR FEAST OF ST. JUDE.

Qu. Our church is dedicated to St. Jude Thaddeus, special patron in temporal needs. The Mass is of SS. Simon and Jude. Do we have to celebrate the Titular feast (28 Oct.) separately, as I am told is the rule, or is the obligation satisfied by reciting the regular office of the two Apostles as given in the Missal and Breviary?

Resp. If one of the Apostles (Simon and Jude) is the Titular of the Church, the office of the other is said on the next free day following, according to the latest rubrics.

In the Office of St. Jude the Lessons of the First Nocturn are from the Epistle of that Saint. In the Office of St. Simon the Lessons are taken from the *Commune Apostolorum* ("Sic nos existimet"). The Lessons of the Second and Third Nocturns for either Apostle are taken from the feast as in the Breviary. In the Mass the same formula holds good for both Apostles, but the name of the one which is not celebrated at the time is omitted in the principal oration, Secret and Postcommunion. (Cf. *Collectio Rerum Liturgicarum:* Wuest and Mullaney, C.SS.R., n. 7100.)

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT THEOLOGY.

The extent and manner of the participation of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the salvation of mankind is a subject that has taken a prominent place in recent theological discussions. Probably the most complete work on this subject—*De Mediatione Universali B. Mariae Virginis quoad Gratias,* by the Rev. J. Bittremieux—has already been noted in the pages of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (Feb. 1927). Other writers discuss the same theme in various theological periodicals—the Rev. R. Vilain, S.J., in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for December 1926; the Rev. J. M. Bover, S.J., in the *Gregorianum* for December 1926 and in the *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* for April 1927; the Rev. A. Deneffe, S.J., in the *Gregorianum* for March 1927.

Although differing in their manner of treating the question, all these theologians agree that Mary's mediatorship is of a twofold character—her participation in the work of the redemption, and her coöperation in the distribution of graces. The basis of her mediatorial office was her free consent to become the Mother of the Redeemer. However, all the efficacy of Mary's mediation is dependent on the merits of her Divine Son. Finally, although it is generally acknowledged that all graces conferred on mankind can truly be said to be bestowed by the Blessed Virgin, it seems more probable that she does not possess any direct or physical causality with respect to supernatural grace, but that her efficacy is limited to the moral order —i. e. by way of intercession.

It must not be thought that the great dignity of universal mediatorship is attributed to Mary on grounds that are merely devotional. Theological arguments of no little weight are adduced to prove that this doctrine in its entirety is contained in the deposit of faith. Canon Bittremieux argues from what he calls the *principium consortii*—the doctrine so frequently inculcated in Scripture and Tradition that the Mother of the Saviour was intimately associated with His life and redemptive work. This principle, Canon Bittremieux contends, implicitly contains Mary's coöperation, not only in the actual work of the redemption but also in the distribution of all graces that flow from it. Fr. Vilain claims that Mary had a *social* rôle

in the Incarnation—that is, it was as the representative of the entire human race that she received the Word Incarnate. In consequence, she incurred relations with every member of the human race, by virtue of which her intercession in heaven is productive of grace for all. Fr. Bover seeks confirmation of Mary's universal mediatorship in the writings of the Fathers and theologians and adduces a number of citations to prove that this doctrine was taught by St. Ephrem and by St. Bonaventure. Fr. Deneffe distinguishes Mary's coöperation in the salvation of the human race into four elements similar to those attributed by St. Thomas to the Passion of Christ (*Summa* P. III. Q. 48) merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption. Her part in the immolation of Calvary, he says, has merited for her the title of *deaconess* of the Sacrifice. However, Fr. Deneffe is of the opinion that Mary did not in any way coöperate in her own redemption.

Since the doctrine of Our Lady's universal mediation is so generally recognized as an element of revealed truth, it would not be surprising if the Church in the near future would elevate this great prerogative of Mary to the rank of a dogma of Catholic faith.

The definability of Mary's corporeal Assumption does not seem to arouse as much attention as it did a few years ago. However, an article in the *Verbum Domini* for August 1926, by the Rev. A. Vitti, S.J., is related to this question. Fr. Vitti gives a brief synopsis of the different accounts of the Assumption that are found in the New Testament apocryphal writings. Although widely different in their details, these narratives all agree on three points—the fact of the Assumption, the presence of all the Apostles, and the location of Our Lady's tomb in the Valley of Josaphat. These points, he concludes, have their origin in sound tradition outside of the apocryphal writings, and hence are not to be rejected merely on the ground of their presence in these unreliable documents.

An excellent presentation of the Catholic doctrine of original sin (*Zur Theodizee der Erbsünde*), the posthumous work of Dr. Joseph Becker, appears in the *Linzer Quartalschrift* for 1926, nos. 3 and 4. Many of the difficulties connected with this doctrine, Fr. Becker points out, are based on the supposition that original sin entails some *personal guilt*. The truth is, whatever of guilt and responsibility is implied in original sin must be attributed to Adam alone. In all his descendants,

original sin is to be regarded merely as the absence of supernatural grace—a condition which in no wise is to be termed *voluntary,* although in the present order of man's elevation to the supernatural plane it is a *privation.* Such a concept of original sin perfectly safeguards God's justice and goodness. For, as is evident, He could decree to confer sanctifying grace on Adam's posterity consequent on Adam's obedience; therefore, there is nothing derogatory to the divine perfections in the mere non-bestowal of the supernatural life on mankind, in the case of our first parent's infringement of God's command. Fr. Becker finds a confirmation of the doctrine of original sin in the miseries and the evil inclinations that beset human nature. He insists, however, that these efflictions are not to be proposed as an indisputable proof of the doctrine, since in a merely natural order, even though immune from original sin, man would be subject to tribulations and temptations.

In sacramental theology, the historical development of Penance is being extensively investigated by theologians. The alleged reservation of capital sins—adultery, murder, and idolatry—in the early Church forms the subject of a series of articles by the Rev. Vincent Hanly in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for September and December 1926 and January 1927. Against some (even Catholics) who held that it was the practice of the early Church to refuse absolution, even in the hour of death, to those guilty of the capital sins, Fr. Hanly argues that such a mode of action historically never was, and theologically never could have been the usage of the universal Church. In support of his historical assertions, he cites and explains a number of patristic writings, especially those of Tertullian and St. Cyprian. His theological argument is that since no post-baptismal mortal sin is forgiven save by reference to the power of the keys, the Church, if she excluded a dying person from sacramental absolution, would deprive him of a necessary means of salvation, and thus would fail grievously in her mission.

It is well to remember that this theological argument is considered unconvincing by a number of very reliable authorities —for instance, Galtier in his recent treatise *De Poenitentia* (n. 214).

The peculiar custom of lay confession, so prevalent in the middle ages, is treated exhaustively in a recent work entitled *La Confession aux Laïques dans L'Église Latine depuis le*

VIII. jusqu' au XIV. Siècle, by the Rev. A. Teetaert, O. Cap. The practice of lay confession, the author shows, owed its origin to two distinct factors. The first was the monastic chapter of faults in which the brethren acknowledged their transgressions before the assembled community. The other factor was the change of attitude regarding the relative importance of the various constitutive elements of the Sacrament of Penance. In the early ages the idea of sacramental satisfaction predominated; but when trifling penances replaced the rigorous satisfaction of former times, the emphasis was transferred to the necessity of confession which, including by its nature considerable humiliation, is in truth a severe penance. Therefore, to the faithful of the middle ages the advisability—and according to some, the obligation—of confessing one's sins to a layman, in case of necessity when no priest could be had. At first, only venial sins were the object of lay confession, but later on even mortal sins were manifested. The practice was fostered by a widely-circulated treatise *De Vera et Falsa Poenitentia,* erroneously ascribed to St. Augustine. In the twelfth century, contrition assumed the principal rôle in the Sacrament of Penance, but lay confession survived, being regarded as a necessary proof of genuine sorrow. Even St. Thomas in his earlier writings seems to favor the necessity of lay confession (*Suppl.* Q. VIII. art. 2). However, there was never a general belief in the Church that this manifestation of sins was a sacrament in the true sense. The termination of lay confession is to be ascribed to Duns Scotus, who emphasized the importance of priestly absolution for the sacramental forgiveness of sin.

Writing in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* 1927, no. 2, on the foundations of an understanding of the scholastic doctrine of penance (*Grundlagen für ein Verständnis der Busslehre der Früh—und Hochscholastik*), Dr. A. Landgraf proposes some very practical points. A correct understanding of the scholastic teaching, he asserts, postulates a general study of the authors of that period, and not merely a knowledge of the more famous teachers. Moreover, theological terms must be interpreted according to the sense given them at that time, which often differed from their modern signification. For example, to the scholastics *attrition* signified, not, as we understand it, a true and sincere detestation of sin based on a motive inferior to charity, but rather a defective sorrow for sin, devoid

of the purpose of amendment and of the intention of confessing. The scholastics' doctrine of penance must be viewed in relation to their ideas of grace and justification. The difference between actual and habitual grace, the part played by the infused virtues in justification, the distinction between the natural and infused virtues—these matters were very imperfectly recognized by the scholastics. Many of them, for example, denied the infusion of the supernatural virtues into the souls of infants at Baptism, because they could not conceive how a habit could be possessed before its proper act had been elicited. The weightiest problem, however, that confronted the scholastics was to determine what efficacy is added to the sacrament of Penance by the priest's absolution, over and above what is necessarily contained in the dispositions of the penitent.

The gradual development in the Church of the doctrine of the sacramental seal is narrated, with the aid of many interesting examples, by the Rev. W. Sharp, S.J., in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for July, 1926. The first formal pronouncement on the obligation of sacramental secrecy was published in the year 419 by the Council of Carthage, which condemned an indirect violation of the seal by one of the African bishops. In the eighth century there was a falling off in the strictness surrounding the secrecy of confession. Thus, in Saxony, custom allowed a priest to declare that a murderer had confessed his sin and done penance for it. This course saved the criminal from death, and while never sanctioned by ecclesiastical authorities, it does not seem to have been condemned. In the twelfth century, Petrus Cantor held that in certain cases a confessor was allowed to reveal sins after the penitent's death. Hugoccio (1210) decided that when a penitent refused to abandon his sinful habits, the confessor might reveal the sin in secret to his parents or to some one else who could exercise a beneficial influence. Even after the rigorous decree of the Lateran Council (1213) certain exceptions to the law of secrecy were allowed by some theologians. Some held that the crime of high treason did not come under the obligation of the seal. Others contended that the external government of religious communities might be influenced by knowledge acquired in the sacramental tribunal. However, ecclesiastical pronouncements and the consensus of theologians have finally brought the Church to full consciousness of the absolute and inexorable binding force of the sacramental seal.

The controversy in the pages of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW between Dr. Donovan and Dr. Schaaf concerning the validity of non-Catholic baptism (February, August, October, 1926) has been the occasion of a paper on the validity of this sacrament as conferred by the Baptists, from the pen of the Rev. T. Bouscaren, S.J., in the *Gregorianum* for March 1927. Fr. Bouscaren holds that, since the predominant intention of these sectarians is to confer the rite instituted by Christ, the sacrament is not invalidated by their erroneous notions concerning the purpose of Baptism. In favor of his views the writer cites several decisions of the Roman Congregations.

The Rev. T. Spacil, S.J., of the Pontifical Oriental Institute of Rome has published a pamphlet on the doctrine of the Orthodox Eastern Church concerning Baptism. He devotes special attention to the explanation and the refutation of the doctrine of *economy,* commonly held by the separated Eastern Christians, which teaches that a sacrament which has been conferred invalidly may be subsequently validated without any sacramental rites by the sovereign power of the Church.

In his book *Mysterium Fidei* (Elucid. 27) and in the *Gregorianum* for September and December 1923, Fr. De la Taille, S.J., proposed his explanation of the Mass stipend. In the Old Law, he says, the person who wished to have a sacrifice offered for his intention provided the priest with a victim, a portion of which, after the sacrifice was offered, accrued in justice to the priest for his support. Analogously, in the New Law, the stipend is intended to provide the material elements of the sacrifice (bread and wine) in such wise that there shall be a share of these material things (or their equivalent) over and above what is necessary for the sacrifice, to provide for the support of the priest who has a right to "live by the altar". The priest, having accepted the stipend, is bound in strict justice to offer the stipulated sacrifice, not by virtue of an *onerous* contract (*do ut facias*) but by reason of a *gratuitous* contract (*ratione rei retentae*). Fr. De la Taille claims for this solution the merits of reconciling the two theological principles, that the fruits of the Mass cannot be bought, and withal that the priest is bound in strict commutative justice to offer the Holy Sacrifice for which he has accepted a stipend.

In the *Revue Ecclesiastique de Liège* for November 1925, the Rev. M. E. Leroux took exception to Fr. De la Taille's view, and proposed another solution—namely, that the obliga-

tion of the Mass stipend arises from two sources—on the part of the faithful, the duty of providing for the wants of the priest, and on the part of the priest, the duty imposed by ecclesiastical law of celebrating for the giver of the stipend. Fr. De la Taille defends his own opinion and argues against Fr. Leroux in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for April 1927.

The physiological theory that real death frequently occurs only some space of time after all signs of life have ceased has led to the common practice, in recent years, of conferring the necessary sacraments conditionally even a considerable time after death has apparently ensued. The Rev. E. Hugon, O.P., in the *Angelicum* for June-September 1926 contends that, once all signs of life have left the body, the sacraments can no longer be validly received, even if *de facto* the soul still remains. For, he argues, the value of the sacraments as *signs* among human beings depends on the *popular* estimate of mankind rather than on *scientific* doctrines. For example, an unbaked mixture of flour and water, though *chemically* not different from bread, cannot be validly consecrated, since it is not *popularly* recognized and designated as bread. Similarly, when all appearances of life have ceased, a person is commonly considered dead, and hence is no longer capable of receiving the Sacraments.

We feel sure, however, that the learned Dominican would concede sufficient probability to the opposite view to justify priests in the continuance of their present practice, mindful of the consoling principle, *Sacramenta propter homines.*

An excellent idea of the trend of religious thought in the Anglican Church is provided by the English periodical, *The Month.* Especially worthy of notice are two papers by the editor, the Rev. J. Keating, S.J., entitled *The Advance Guard of Anglicanism* and *The Opinions of Anglicanism,* in the current February and April numbers respectively. The former article reveals the mental attitude of those Anglicans who are striving to bring about a reunion with the Catholic Church. The latter shows how divergent are the doctrines which prevail among the members of the Church of England, and which have been brought to the front in connexion with the recent revision of the Prayer Book.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R., S.T.D.

Mount St. Alphonsus,
Esopus, N. Y.

Criticisms and Notes

THE ENCYCLICALS OF PIUS XI. Introduction and Translation by James H. Ryan, D.D., of the Faculty of Philosophy in the Catholic University of America. B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis. Pp. xlvi + 248.

Dr. Ryan gives us in this volume an excellent translation of ten Encyclicals of the Holy Father. They relate to the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ; the Third Centenary of the Death of St. Francis de Sales; The Sixth Centenary of the Canonization of St. Thomas Aquinas; The Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Death of St. Francis of Assisi; The Persecution of the Church in Mexico. The text is preceded by an Introduction of 46 pages which contains a most interesting sketch of the Holy Father and a brief explanation of each of the Encyclicals as it appears in the course of his thought as he deals with current world problems. A careful reading of the Introduction, whose charm rests upon the thorough knowledge and skill in exposition of the author, prepares one for the understanding of each Encyclical in itself and in relation to the Pontificate of Pius XI taken as a whole. The volume finds its place as an important contribution to fundamental Catholic literature. It brings together in convenient and attractive form authoritative pronouncements of the Holy Father on national and international problems, on the relation of the Church to the structure of supernatural life, on the lamentable drift of the world away from spiritual truth and standards of Christian morality; and on personal piety. Thus in range of appeal and authority of direction the work commends itself to all Catholics whose sympathies extend beyond personal interest and to others who may wish to know the mind of the Church in presence of modern confusion.

The publication of this volume furnishes occasion for the restatement of certain principles and suggestions as to methods which are of concern to all priests. Everything should be done by pastors to keep the mind of the faithful in close touch with the mind of the Church. Any Encyclical should be made known and explained to the people in order that they may feel with the Church and think with the Church in relation to the place of our Faith in the world. Indifference to these larger interests is a flaw in Catholic life. Catholic colleges for both men and women should aim to do the same service for students in a more formal and authoritative manner. Catholic men and women who have attained to positions of leadership in Catholic life and are looked upon as interpreters of Catholic

thought should as well be informed on all pronouncements of the Holy See which are of universal as distinct from purely local appeal. If pastors, teachers and leaders do not feel the truth of this, Papal Encyclicals will have little interest for them.. If, however, they do feel all of this should be done, they will give to the Papal Encyclicals an outstanding place in all Catholic life.

The writer of this review attended last June the Commencement exercises of a Catholic high school where 102 students, both boys and girls, were graduated. A non-Catholic gentleman of the city sent 102 copies of a recent work on the Constitution of the United States and asked the pastor to present one copy to each graduate in order to promote intelligent understanding of American institutions and vigorous love of country. The donor perceived the relation of education to our national life. Would it not be well if we felt similar concern for the interests of our college youth in the work of the Church in the world? Might not similar use of this collection of the Encyclicals of Pius XI do much to inspire our youth with love of the Church, with pride in the authority and wisdom of the Papacy and lead them to feel that they have back of them in their struggle for personal sanctification and social righteousness the tremendous power of the Kingdom of Christ.

THE HOUSE OF MARTHA AT BETHANY. By Herman J. Heuser, D.D. Longmans Green & Co., New York. 1927. Pp. 262.

The author undertakes in this volume to give us a representation of the thought and relations of the favored little group which is the connecting link between Christ and the Christian centuries. We meet the divine mother of our Lord, Lazarus, Mary of Magdala, Martha, Joseph, the Apostles, Stephen, and Saul, and their friends, as they remembered Christ, understood His teaching and their mission in relation to the nascent Church. The exposition is intended to suggest or to symbolize the remote beginnings of many elements in our spiritual life to-day. If the reader upon taking up the book will turn to the Index and select any detail of our spiritual practice, he will find in the text Old Testament traditions, analogies and interpretation which cross the centuries and give deeper significance to the piety of to-day. One might take at random the Way of the Cross, Holy Water, the Vows, the Religious Habit, the Office, the Tabernacle, or the Our Father, and find each of these related by the author's method and interpretation to features of the thought, life or worship found in the little group mentioned. (The Our Father will be found in the Index under the word "Abina".) After doing this, the reader will be able to follow the author with

much better effect and with appreciation of the wide range of knowledge that he has brought to his task. The merit of the work, apart from the scholarly way in which it is done, rests upon the problem that it sets up and the method that is employed. It may be well to describe these as the reviewer understands them.

The House of Martha at Bethany is addressed to the individual reader with a view to the enrichment of personal spiritual life. It keeps in mind particularly those who give themselves up completely to a life of faith, priests and religious, who are citizens of the supernatural world and pilgrims here. It recognizes the supreme value of historical background for the institutions and practices of daily piety. The author seems to perceive the tendency of beliefs and practice to become doctrinal and impersonal, and to be accepted without corresponding imagination. In this way we are inclined in the religious life to rest content in the cycle of daily activity, to lose contact with historical beginnings and to be deprived of the joy and strength that such contact furnishes.

The unbroken traditions that unite the beginnings of the Church of Christ to its later amazing development over all of the continents of the world appeal to us profoundly. Sacraments, sacramentals, ceremony, the worship of the Blessed Eucharist, religious communities, the constitution and operation of Church authority and the intimate pieties of spiritual life as we know them and as they shape us, seem far removed by their complexity and magnitude from the simple beginnings of the Church. And yet we know by the certainty of faith that every essential element of to-day's belief and worship has its Divine origin in those remote beginnings. Centuries separate us from them. The ways of life, the color of circumstance, and the drift of our mind emphasize that separation. Theological and Biblical scholarship has elaborated our doctrine with form and exactness. Historical research has brought to the surface wonderful stories of the development of institution, worship and ceremony. All of this belongs to our literary wealth and perhaps leaves daily piety somewhat unaffected and imagination unstirred. These results of scholarship are given to the Church as a whole. They are not directed toward the imagination and emotions of the individual soul. Now scholarship has to do with imagination and feeling as well as with research and logic. Certainly then it is well worth while to take the details of present-day worship as they relate to the individual soul and to assemble behind them the results of scholarly investigation. This will enable us one by one to-day to live in intimate association in the reality of personal experience with that blessed group that took the torch of revelation from the Hand of Christ and handed it down to guide our steps to-day. Dr.

Heuser has undertaken to do this and his equipment has enabled him to do it admirably.

Our wish and our need go even farther. They reach back to the days before Christ, in the hope of seizing and holding those superb traditions of worship, psalm and ceremony whose splendor and truth survived the waywardness of the Jew and the mistakes of his national imagination and race pride. Hence *The House of Martha* carries us back to those holy traditions and we find with satisfaction many of the details of our spiritual life related by imitation or analogy to the venerable practices of pre-Christian days that had the high sanction of Divine origin. The method that the author has followed is universally employed when scholars attempt to reconstruct for the modern mind any historical period. It is a combined work of erudition, imagination, historical sense and smooth narrative. The countless fragments of information that research discovers are melted into one picture that satisfies historical accuracy, keeps interpretations within suitable limits and sets before us a living picture of past time.

The House of Martha will appeal profoundly to all of the members of our Sisterhoods. The reading of it in private or in community will invest their sipiritual life with new significance and refreshment. Clerical readers will recognize the service of historical imagination in reënforcing piety and will owe many happy hours to the reading of it. The work takes a worthy place among the many other volumes that we owe to Dr. Heuser's busy pen.

AMERICA COMES OF AGE. A French Analysis. By André Siegfried. Translated from the French by H. H. Hemming and Doris Hemming. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York. 1927. Pp. 358.

Judicious criticism leading to self-examination has the advantage in the case of the national commonwealth of lessening a false patriotism which glories in outward demonstration while it weakens the spirit of service that makes for coöperation and unity. The American people as a national unit has often been the subject of foreign criticism during the past century from various and from opposing points of view. The humorous notes by English writers, like Dickens and Thackeray, on their visits to the United States, emphasized certain popular defects; but these did not serve as correctives, as they marked merely the extravagances and oddities of an immature national body, regarded as part of a nation's youth and in the light of idiosyncrasies rather than serious faults. Apart from such critics whose impressions, though embodied in classical

literature, are of passing interest, we have had a multitude of writers who after visiting the United States have left their opinion of us on record. The value of their estimates is on the whole ephemeral, and as such also negligible.

During the last generation, however, the apparently settled attitude in political, educational and social life of the American people has drawn the attention of serious students to regard our condition as a nation in the light of historical development. They have come to see the advantages of our independence which dispenses us from following traditions and conventions that hinder the exercise of personal freedom, while our abundance of new resources enables us to give success to our enterprises.

In this light Professor André Siegfried, member of the School of Social Sciences in Paris, reviews the conditions of the American people as a political unit. In doing so he covers practically every aspect of our national and social conduct, including the problems of States' solidarity, race assimilation, negro equality, the Yellow Peril, labor questions, education and religion in America, and lastly our relations to Europe, notably England and France, before and since the late war.

The author has derived his knowledge from repeated visits, once as secretary of a French political mission, which gave him opportunities of personal contact with men and institutions in practically every State of the Union. His observations and judgments are here published by request of the French Musée Social.

The prevailing attitude of mind with which the author approaches his subject is that of a social student who seeks to eliminate all prejudices in passing judgment on our moral and material standing before the world. He describes us as coming of age and finding ourselves perplexed with responsibilities of great importance at home and abroad. Mass production in industry calls for a new standard of what is broadly called civilization as a mode of popular living. Immigration, with the difficulties of racial assimilation under federal and local law, bears a direct relation to other countries which demands on the part of our government and the dependent authorities a careful study of the reactions of peoples and nations in the spheres of psychology and politics. To this study Professor Siegfried lends valuable lights by his analysis of the ethical, economic and political situation in the United States. He comes to the conclusion that "the American people are now creating on a vast scale an entirely original social structure which bears only a superficial resemblance to the European. The War installed the United States prematurely in an unassailable position of economic supremacy . . . It is a materialistic society, organized to produce things rather than people, with output set up as a god."

These last words indicate the chief reason for directing the attention of the clerical reader to the volume, as it contains a lesson worth our pondering. Our French writer, Alsatian by birth, reviews the religious aspects represented by the different denominations in the United States. He points out their strength and the influence they exercise upon the population, on the political, educational and moral plane of progress and unification. In doing so he also indicates the weaknesses of the different sects and of the Catholic Church as distinct formative elements in promoting public welfare. He is frank in his criticisms and if they show his leaning toward Protestantism they are sufficiently objective to bring home their truth, even where they wound our vanity or irritate by their partiality. It will suffice here to quote passages from the chapter on "The Religious Aspect" to characterize his general treatment of the subject. Writes Professor Siegfried:

"There is something extraordinarily human, broad and unassuming about this great institution [the Catholic Church] where the humblest, the sinner, and even the negro (almost!) can communicate together. When one compares it with the Protestant churches, one realizes how profoundly true is its title, the Universal Church. We are struck by the same repose when we consider the attitude of the Catholic Church toward moral problems. The solicitude of the priest is entirely concentrated on the family, and through it on the education of the young; for he champions the rights of the family against both the state and the community . . . In comparison with the naïvété of the reformer, the Catholic priest seems to be endowed with years of secular experience. He does not ask too much of frail humanity, nor does he use up his reserve energy in demanding the impossible . . . It is also to be noted that his complete submission to an august and universal authority gives him a certain poise, which troubled consciences deny to the Fundamentalist ministers . . .

"The faithful are astonishingly devout, but they are ruled by the fear of hell-fire and by the priest whom they endow with superhuman powers. One can scarcely say that he is venerated, but he is undoubtedly loved and obeyed implicitly; for his flock shut their eyes to his defects as a man . . . He can ask for anything for his church or his political party (linked up with the most fervid nationalist movements, such as the Irish) . . .

"Similar traits are to be found among the other Catholic communities, German, Italian or Polish, all of which are still close to the religious institutions of the past. Hence the foreign note which pervades the Catholic Church in the New World, where all its old political and religious roots are piously preserved . . . The

Catholic Church is thus a thing apart in the heart of the American body politic. It collaborates in its own way, but in the long run it remains distinct . . .

"The priest who tries to save his congregation from over-rapid Americanization is himself a complete American in his outlook on life and in his daily habits. He is a business man who administers his church on the same lines as the most practical Modernists. Not only in his parish but also in his religious institutions, he is accustomed to a degree of comfort which he does not intend to abandon. He insists on having central heating, baths, and Pullmans whenever he travels; and worse still, he has reached the point of despising his European colleagues for their poverty . . . Like all good Americans he believes that the intensity of religious life is measured by the cubic contents of church buildings, and meditation and mystical repose seem to him little better than morbid manifestations.

"In America the dominant force that is threatening to carry everything before it, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, is the obsession for tangible and material accomplishments. At times it seems as if the object of religion were no longer to kindle mysticism in the soul and spirit, but to enlist them and organize their energies. In this it is the most powerful lever for production that the world has ever known" (pp. 48-53).

So far as this analysis is true, it appears that the Spouse of Christ, herself incorruptible, is being viewed by others, including her American children, as a mother to be honored not only through material things but for the sake of acquiring them. How widely this tendency deflects Catholics from the ideals set forth in the Gospel of Christ is matter for reflexion.

H. J. H.

LA RAISON D'ETRE DU MAL D'APRES SAINT AUGUSTIN. Dissertation présentée pour le grade de Maitre agrégé en Théologie de l'Université Grégorienne de Rome. By Gérard Philips. Louvain: Museum Lessianum. 1927. Pp. 241.

The author of this dissertation says that he is not especially concerned with St. Augustine's ideas on the freedom of the will. He does not propose to treat of the great African Doctor's teaching on the metaphysical essence of evil, which is but a privation of being, nor the universality of original sin. He intends to give St. Augustine's answers to the questions: Why does a good God permit the evils which one encounters in nature? Why did He not prevent evil from issuing from free will? Why above all did He permit the

malice and misery of original sin to be detrimental to the whole human race?

In the eight chapters of this work we find a statement of the aim of creation and the reasons why God permits sin and temporal and eternal punishment. There is even a chapter on the sin of the angels. The writer shows that St. Augustine's teaching on evil was the result of his defence of Divine Providence against the Manicheans and Pelagians. The Manicheans held that human nature is essentially evil, whereas the Pelagians taught that human nature is so good that it needs not grace to remove the stain of original sin. The celebrated Latin Doctor steered a middle course between these extreme positions.

The author has carefully arrayed quotations from the writings of St. Augustine, giving them in French with the original Latin in the footnotes. He has given an interesting exposition of the doctrine of St. Augustine which many may read with profit. It can scarcely be maintained that the work presents something quite new. So many books have been written on the greatest thinker of the Patristic age that it is exceedingly difficult to be entirely original. The bibliography given by the author manifests his acquaintance with the literature of the subject. With the aid of the detailed table of contents and an index of authors one can easily find one's way in the book.

LA VIE CONTEMPLATIVE. Par Mgr. P. Lejeune. P. Lethielleux, Paris. Pp. 84.

Monsignor Lejeune defines the contemplative life as one in which the predominant portion is given to prayer. If one's life is not devoted more to prayer than to work it is active not contemplative. The laity are not excluded from the contemplative life, for it is possible for them to devote more time to prayer than to active work.

In order to attain to the contemplative life a soul must go through a fourfold purification: 1. *purity of conscience*, which consists in a firm resolution never to offend God again even by the least sin; 2. *purity of heart*, which implies freedom from all attachments not only sinful but even innocent if they give to the creature any affection that belongs to God; 3. *purity of mind*, which masters absolutely the imagination so that it does not wander here and there among the empty things of sense; 4. *purity of action*, in virtue of which one never does anything except to please God.

Bishop, priests, professors in seminaries, missionaries, teachers and catechists are called upon to lead a mixed life in which prayer is not merely an appendage, but rather an essential part. St.

Bernard, who was the most active man and the greatest apostle of his age, St. Francis Xavier, who converted kingdoms to Christ and devoted six hours daily to prayer, are witnesses to the fact that contemplation and active work can be combined in the same life.

An American reader will perhaps feel a little ruffled when he reads this sentence: "If works are valued at a higher price than prayer, one comes to the disastrous consequences that Leo XIII brought to light in his letter to Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore" (p. 52). But the humble reader will pass over the problem of whether or not his country is specially deserving of this criticism and ask himself the question whether or not his own life merits the slur that is intended.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By Evelyn Tarker. Longmans Green & Co., New York, 1927. $1.25.

This charming and instructive little book "is principally designed for the assistance of those who are preparing for the teaching profession and who, while required to use these portions of the Sacred Scriptures for the purpose of their doctrinal instructions, have not hitherto prosecuted any study in this region" (Foreword). Since Holy Scripture is one source of our supernatural revelation (Vatican Council, Session III), it is refreshing to see it utilized in this way for the elucidation of Catholic doctrine in our educational system. The method of the book is adapted to its purpose. Stress is laid upon the description of the historical background of events. This feature will prove very attractive to pupils. An Introduction gives us a vivid picture of the world to which St. Paul preached, the world of the Roman Empire. He carried the Gospel to a people starving for it. A religion which could give the best answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" as Christianity could do, was bound to conquer the mind of the Mediterranean world.

The Acts of the Apostles is treated in seven chapters. The first, The Beginnings of the Church, deals with Chapters I to XII of the Acts. This part of the work is perhaps too brief. The author is evidently anxious to get to her favorite subject, St. Paul, for whom she sings an admirable hymn of praise. The next Chapters describe the missionary journeys of St. Paul. The author has a pleasant gift, somewhat like Martindale's or Ramsay's, of acquainting the reader always with the historical and religious-philosophical *milieu* by which St. Paul was confronted. This is done on the whole with scientific accuracy.

The second part of the work might have been entitled "The Doctrines of the Epistles of St. Paul". The chief teachings of St. Paul on Christ, the Church, Grace, and Faith, are presented with great clearness. It follows a very practical chapter on "St. Paul's Doctrine on Christian Character" and the Epilogue on St. Paul himself. This method serves admirably the purpose of the book, as do also the chronological summary of St. Paul's life and a chronological table of the Epistles.

The author makes some statements that one may be inclined to question. Some such are that, "the Tarsians never became Hellenized" (page 24); that St. Paul was so badly hurt in Lystra that he was thought to be dead, a corpse, though he "the next day went with Barnabas to Derbe" (page 35); that the inscription to the Unknown God meant to "whatever god had influence in that place" (page 47); that St. Paul was "chained day and night to a soldier" (page 64); that they "passed into the fierce Adriatic Sea and so east across it" (page 63).

The Gallio-inscription, so important for the chronology of St. Paul's life, might have received more thorough treatment. The translation of the Westminster version (page 79), "He did not set great store on his equality with God," is wrong. By an oversight Father Lagrange is identified with the Biblical Institute.

Literary Chat

Benziger Brothers of New York have just brought out three additional little volumes in The Orchard Books, a series of spiritual classics. Dom Roger Hudleston, O.S.B., of Downside Abbey, is general editor. *The Revelations of Divine Love,* by Mother Julian of Norwich, is No. II of the general series (pp. XXXVI, 256). She lived in the fourteenth century. *Eden's Fourfold River,* an instruction on contemplative life and prayer written about the year 1200 (pp. XXVII, 98), author unknown, is No. 4 of the Extra series; and *The Amending of Life,* by Richard Rolle, born about 1300 (pp. XVII, 55), is No. 5. The volumes in the Extra series are similar in character to the others, but are issued at a lower price. The list of publications in both series is given at the end of the last-named volume. Each of the works is preceded by a scholarly introduction which gives information about its origin, manuscript forms and variations. The convenient size of these little books (one will fit into a coat pocket) is an inviting feature of them. They carry one back to the days when intense realization of spiritual truth gave direction to life and thought in a way quite in contrast with modern life. Any priest will gain advantage from a study of that contrast.

The activity seen on all sides in the production of spiritual literature may be looked upon in two ways. It is an enrichment of our spiritual resources. In a time of universal reading, literature is a response to a demand. On the other hand, spiritual literature is an indication of a tendency to break the moorings that hold us to spiritual truth. Writers inter-

pret the drift of things away from ideals and by their writings call us back to them. To-day when religion outside of the Catholic Church is so weakened and uncertain, the output of literature about religion is enormous. The appearance of any new spiritual treatise should draw our attention toward the conditions which invite it. If we do this we shall not content ourselves with reading. We shall on the contrary find our powers of observation sharpened and our insight into the mission of faith made more clear.

Facing Life, by Raoul Plus, S.J., an approved translation, is a volume of 121 pages of meditations for young men. (Benziger Brothers, New York.) The author reminds us that meditation is not intended for the cloister alone. He asks young men in the world to devote at least fifteen minutes a day to personal prayer and to spiritual thinking that is known as meditation. The volume is intended to guide young men of good will toward a good-natured development of these elementary forms of loyalty to one's soul. Thought is directed along the ordinary lanes of personal experience, and concrete personal ideals are commended. The reading of this little work by a pastor might lead him to realize more clearly the need of developing habits of personal piety among young men. Any book does its best work when it arouses the reader to an interest in the larger situation with which it deals. The need of personal individual appeal to the young under the guidance of intelligent sympathy with them and understanding of them is assuredly pressing to-day. If we can induce our young men to adopt the habit of meditation as our author suggests, they will be blessed and they will bless the Church. The task invites our zeal.

The tireless pen of Father Edward F. Garesché, S.J., has just given us a new volume (*Mirrors of God,* The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee). The Preface indicates its purpose, "To help us to discern the lineaments of God's beauty and lovableness from the dim mirrors of creatures, each of which reflects in its own way something of the perfections of its Creator. The earth and the Heavens with all their array, the stars, the sea, the skies, the flowers, the race of men, human history, the marvels of science, the heroism of great souls, all of these aid us to conceive the goodness and the lovableness of God, and to fan the flames of our love of Him by the contemplation of His wonderful works." The volume will accomplish much if it can arrest the mind of the reader, release it from the multiplied confusions that are forced upon one and lead toward a simple spiritual outlook upon creation. No other outlook is true or satisfying or peace-giving. We are helped by this work to see God everywhere as saints and poets and dreamers have seen and declared Him. The volume may rest its thesis happily upon the definition of the Vatican Council that God can be found with certainty by the natural light of human reason beholding created things. The reader will find it interesting to bring Wisdom, Chapter 13; Romans, Chapter 1:19 f; Acts 14:16; Psalms 18:1, to the reading of Father Garesché's interesting pages.

A pamphlet of 32 pages by the Rev. Dr. Charles P. Bruehl (*The Evil of Mixed Marriages,* Joseph Schaeffer, New York), discusses one of the most difficult problems of Catholic social life. The author sets forth the difficulties inherent in mixed marriages and offers much wise and practical advice in respect of their prevention. By its own merit and directness, the pamphlet ought to contribute to the adequate understanding of the feeling of the Church. But a difficulty remains in inducing those who need this instruction to read it and apply its lessons to themselves.

Pastors should insist that parents supervise the associations of their children. Many parents complain that they are unable to do this, particularly in these days of youthful self-assertion. Superficial views of life and of marriage lead many of our youths to look upon the latter carelessly and to marry without sufficient foresight. Again there is a tendency to look upon marriage as a matter of purely personal concern without tak-

ing into account its Christian relation to the Church and its natural relation to the race. Hence when these wider bearings of marriage are set forth, many pay little attention to them. Once an attachment is formed, whatever its depth or dignity, little can be done, as Dr. Bruehl well says. Hence he urges the need of instruction and direction of the young before this stage of association is reached. One cannot argue against emotion.

Some years ago a small number of graduates of a Catholic woman's college stated that, as far as their views went, likeness of culture had as much if not more to do with attachment, than likeness of faith. In as far as this is true it is lamentable. A mixed marriage brings two conflicting philosophies of life to bear upon the most intimate of all human relations. It is like building a house upon a split foundation. Unless our youth can be brought to see the far-reaching significance of this we shall have grave difficulty in winning them to a wholesome attitude toward Christian marriage. If the feelings and decisions of some of our Catholic college youth fail to take direction from the instruction that is ordinarily given to them in our schools, early efforts against mixed marriages will be in a measure futile. Our literature on mixed marriages is perhaps abundant enough, but we lack means of making it effective in its direct and personal appeal. Dr. Bruehl's little pamphlet will contribute to the development of right attitudes. He concludes his discussion with a striking extract from an Encyclical of Leo XIII of 10 February, 1880, in which the mind of the Church is admirably set forth.

The seven-hundredth anniversary of the death of St. Francis of Assisi has led to a striking revival of interest in this great saint and to a corresponding enrichment of our literature. The Educational Conference of the Franciscan Fathers held in 1926 took up the general problem of Ascetical Theology. At the Conference Father Antony Linneweber, O.F.M., read a paper on "The Man Who Saw God". It was a discussion of the asceticism and mysticism of St. Francis. The author has just republished it in a well-bound booklet of 152 pages. (St. Boniface Friary, San Francisco.) He has added eight illustrations in sepia portraying events from the life of the saint.

A saint who could break every personal and social tyranny that obscured his spiritual vision and who could without reservation or reluctance surrender to the complete dominion of a spiritual ideal is able, as St. Francis was, to quicken the highest spiritual aspirations of the Christian world. His spiritual impulses led him to cloister his heart and to go out among men like the voice of God calling them back to the enjoyment of their spiritual heritage. While wish would have led him to the contemplative life, duty sent him out among the by-ways of the world. The combination of the active with the contemplative life effected in the Franciscan community made him a world figure and gave him universal appeal that has been strengthened with the centuries.

The Forty Hours' Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament is a marked feature of Catholic devotional life. It is, of course, intended to promote the worship of the Blessed Sacrament and to stimulate prayer. Although its historical origin is not altogether clear, it is found in Milan as early as 1527. Its development has proceeded under strong ecclesiastical approval in a way to make it a fixed and universal form of devotion. Although in Rome the Clementine instructions forbid sermons at this devotion, standard authors recommend in a general way short sermons which may be expected to stimulate piety and give direction to the spiritual life of worshippers. Under such sanction Father Peter Geierman, C.SS.R., of Mt. St. Clemens College, De Soto, Missouri, has just published twelve sermons suitable for the devotion of the Forty Hours. (*The Eucharistic Emmanuel,* B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis.) Each sermon is preceded by an outline and the book contains a good Index. It will be of great service to busy priests who continue the praiseworthy tradition of preaching during the Forty Hours' Devotion.

Father Francis Boyle, an Irish curate, has done good service to the cause of the literary revival in the Free State, by the publication of a biographical sketch of Canon Patrick Sheehan of Doneraile. The twelve brief chapters in which he sums up the activity of "Father Pat" as a priest and writer will also diffuse appreciation of the modern prophet of Ireland's political and educational regeneration among younger students in America. Canon Sheehan was a man of "plain living and high thinking" who will remain a model for the parochial clergy wherever Celtic missionary zeal interprets the Catholic faith through the English language. There is probably more pastoral theology condensed in readable form in *Luke Delmege* and in *My New Curate* than will be learnt from the scholastic treatises taught in our seminaries. On the other hand, the student of English literature will find as much food for solid thought and dramatic expression in *Under the Cedars and Stars* as may be gathered from our most popular English classics. Father Boyle's ninety-five pages offer only a sketch, but they will serve to create fresh appreciation of the dozen or more deeply interesting and instructive volumes by "Daddy Dan". (Gill & Son, Dublin; P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York.)

Popular writers who, though not professing the Catholic faith, discuss the history, teaching and spirit of the Roman Church, fail in most cases to understand and interpret her doctrines and practices, which they see only from the outside. A notable exception are the volumes by Vida D. Scudder dealing with the periods of the Franciscan foundation (*Brother John:* Little, Brown & Co., Boston) and of the Papacy in exile at Avignon (*The Disciple of a Saint,* E. P. Dutton, New York). With a singularly fine sense of discrimination and in exceptionally eloquent language she pictures the leading personages, such as the immediate disciples of St. Francis, and those of St. Catherine of Siena, in a way that holds the reader and withholds partial judgment. She evidently understands the age, the traditions and the ideals of the men and women whom she describes in fascinating detail which distributes lights and shadows with the touch of accomplished art. Catholic students who look for historic religious fact in which human weakness blends with strength of virtuous aspiration, as distinct from sentimental devotion, will do well to study the style and scope of writing set forth in *The Disciple of a Saint* with a scarcely less attractive style in the more recent volume *Brother John — a Tale of the First Franciscans.*

Our readers are already familiar with the story of the Trappist religious, *Michael Carlier,* whose training in virtue amid the cloistered retirement of La Trappe, matured in him the heroic spirit of a soldier who gave more than his earthly life for the defence of his native country in the great war. The story of his life and of the monastic institution (which is "not something, it is Somebody") is told with a graphic pen by the French biographer, himself a student of the contemplative life and of the soul which gave actuality to the courage and self-sacrifice of the soldier and leader on the battlefield. The translator, brother in the spiritual warfare of Lieutenant Carlier, has faithfully reproduced the singularly beautiful and elevating portrait of Brother Maxime who found it "simple to die" amidst his brothers. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York.)